

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Bunker Hill Lodge, International Association of Mechanics, favoring construction of revenue cutter at the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of Kansas, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Ed. Mahley and others, for construction of the battleship *New York* in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of M. L. Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for construction of a post-office building at Stuttgart, Ark. (H. R. 32215); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of J. J. Wilmert and others and memorial of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Lincoln, Ill., relating to H. R. 23641; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of L. Eiseminger & Sons, of Broadwell, Ill., against the parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Model Grange, No. 561, Winnebago, Wis., for parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of United States Customs Employees' Mutual Benevolent Association of New York, for increase of salaries as per House joint resolution 258; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of business men of Delphos, Ohio, for construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 31, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the constitution adopted by the constitutional convention of the Territory of Arizona (S. Doc. No. 798), which, on motion of Mr. KEAN, was (with the accompanying paper) referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

Fred Blum and sundry subnumbered cases (Pensacola Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 791);

Nicholas A. Brooks (Brooklyn Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 792);

Mrs. Martin Grady, widow of Martin Grady, deceased (Norfolk Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 793);

William Evans and sundry subnumbered cases (Washington, D. C., Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 794);

Sanford Bilyen and sundry subnumbered cases (League Island Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 795);

William A. Ashe and sundry subnumbered cases (Portsmouth Navy Yard, N. H.) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 796); and

Allen Bush and sundry subnumbered cases (Pensacola Navy Yard) *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 797).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

EAST WASHINGTON HEIGHTS TRACTION RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 799), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE CAPITAL TRACTION CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Capital Traction Co. for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1330), which was referred to

the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a telegram from the speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, transmitting certain information relative to the adoption by that body of a joint resolution requesting Congress to pass the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 30, 1911.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, Washington, D. C.:

The Ohio House of Representatives, with but one dissenting vote, has passed joint resolution No. 5, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the Sulloway bill, known as H. R. 29346. This resolution is now pending in the senate.

S. J. VINING, Speaker.

CHAS. W. KEMPFL, Clerk.

Mr. KEAN presented the memorial of D. T. MacLeod, of Merchantville, N. J., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of Excelsior Lodge, No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Phillipsburg, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Star & Wave Publishing Co., of Cape May City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Summit, East Orange, Newark, and Plainfield, all in the State of New Jersey, and of sundry citizens of Nanuet, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Grand Army posts of Millville, Newton, Toms River, New Brunswick, Camden, Mount Holly, Beverly, Weehawken, Rahway, Mullica Hill, Vineland, Hopewell, Cape May City, Tuckerton, Perth Amboy, Burlington, Jersey City, Woodbury, and Newark, Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic; of George G. Meade Camp, No. 29, Sons of Veterans, of Belleville; and of sundry citizens of Plainfield, Morristown, Asbury Park, Vineland, and Rutherford, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Sarsfield Club, of Long Island City, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of 104 citizens of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the selection of the site for the proposed colored normal school, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Unions Nos. 301, 266, 235, and 537, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Concord, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the New Hampshire Weekly Publishers' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the North Carolina Society of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance of permanent forests at the headwaters of navigable streams, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 2.

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represents that—

Whereas large areas of sections 16 and 36 in every township granted to the State of Idaho by the act of Congress of July 3, 1890,

have been embraced within forest reservations, and it is necessary for the State to have the right to make indemnity selections and have them excluded from the national forests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to enact an act providing for the adjustment of the claims of the States and Territories to lands within national forests, H. R. 10584, Calendar No. 591, which passed the House of Representatives April 13, 1910.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of our Representatives in Congress.

The above senate joint memorial No. 2 passed the senate on the 19th day of January, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

The above senate joint memorial No. 2 passed the house of representatives on the 25th day of January, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the above senate joint memorial No. 2 originated in the senate during the eleventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

CHAS. W. DEMPSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, W. L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 2, by Kerns, memorializing Congress of the United States in relation to sections 16 and 36, embraced within the national forest reservations.

Passed the senate January 19, 1911.

Passed the house January 25, 1911.

Which was filed in this office the 25th day of January, A. D. 1911, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 25th day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

W. L. GIFFORD, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, prays that the land and buildings comprising the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation and barracks may be granted to Whitman College. The reasons deemed sufficient to justify this memorial are set forth in the following statement:

The War Department has determined that the military service does not require the maintenance of a military post at Fort Walla Walla and the troops have been withdrawn, except a few necessary caretakers, so that in future the preservation of the property will be a burden upon the Government, without any compensating benefit.

The property is, by reason of its situation and character, adapted to the needs of Whitman College. Its use by the college will be the best use to which it can be devoted, and the Nation will derive the greatest benefit from the property by intrusting it to an institution in every way worthy and capable of using it in the cause of higher education.

There is within the boundaries of the reservation a soldiers' cemetery, containing the graves of a number of men who died while in the military service of the United States. This cemetery has been well kept by the officers and soldiers heretofore stationed at Fort Walla Walla, and if the prayer of your memorialist shall be granted the trustees of Whitman College will assume an obligation to so care for this soldiers' cemetery as to show perpetually the respect due to our country's defenders.

Texas and Hawaii became annexed to the United States without contributing anything to the wealth of the Nation as a land proprietor, and other acquisitions of territory, except the Oregon country, were purchased and paid for out of the National Treasury; but more than 300,000 square miles of country, comprising the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming, became part of our national domain through the instrumentality of patriotic pioneers, of whom Dr. Marcus Whitman was a type and a leader. They penetrated the wilderness and wrested that country, with its wealth of land, forests, mines, waters, and fisheries, from the grasp of a foreign corporation and held it until the growth of the public sentiment forced the Government to bring to a conclusion the diplomatic controversy with respect to its ownership by the treaty with Great Britain of 1846, whereby the American title was finally recognized and established.

The scene of one of the tragedies of American history is in the immediate vicinity of Fort Walla Walla. There a monument commemorates the lives of Dr. Whitman and his wife and a dozen of their associates, part of the vanguard of American civilization, who were massacred by the aboriginal inhabitants. Our Nation loves to honor those whose names illuminate the pages of its history. For that purpose the Government has willingly expended liberal appropriations in payment for statuary, monuments, and paintings produced by the most talented artists of the world, and the granting of Fort Walla Walla as a contribution to the college founded by an intimate friend and coworker of Dr. Whitman to honor his memory and which has appealed to the sentiment of public-spirited, patriotic citizens, bringing responses in liberal contributions to its endowment, will be heartily approved by the people at large. In return for the national aggrandizement resulting directly from the exertion, privations, and sacrifices of the Oregon pioneers, the Nation can well afford to bestow one section of land and the buildings which it does not require for use as a gift to an institution of learning which the people of the three Northwestern States have adopted as an object of their solicitude and pride.

Whitman College is a privately endowed, nonsectarian, Christian college, intended to supply the need of those States for such an institution

of higher education. It commands the respect and has the earnest sympathy of learned people and good people in every section of the United States, and its destiny is to grow in importance as the country surrounding it shall advance in all the ways that mark the development of arts and sciences. No more fitting monument has been erected, nor to a worthier man.

The State of Washington and its citizens have paid for and donated to the United States the land comprised within two military posts, viz, Fort Lawson, near Seattle, and Fort Wright, near Spokane, each including more than 1,000 acres. These lands were purchased after they became valuable and after they had been selected for military use, and the acquisition thereof for the use of the Government involved labor and patience on the part of the public-spirited citizens in soliciting contributions of land and money, in overcoming objections of owners, and their present value is many times greater than the highest estimate of the value of Fort Walla Walla.

Therefore your said memorialist earnestly recommends the passage of the said resolution and represents that the State of Idaho desires the granting of the land and buildings of the said Fort Walla Walla Military Reserve be made to Whitman College.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 23d day of January, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 24th day of January, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

This memorial received by the governor on the 25th day of January, 1911, at 11.20 o'clock, and approved on the 25th day of January, 1911.

JAMES H. HAWLEY, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 3 originated in the house of representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho during the eleventh session.

JAMES H. WALLIS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, W. L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 3, by Black and Galloway, recommending the passage of a resolution granting what is known as Fort Walla Walla Military Reserve and buildings thereon to Whitman College, in the State of Washington.

Passed the house January 23, 1911.

Passed the senate January 24, 1911.

Which was filed in this office the 25th day of January, A. D. 1911, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

W. L. GIFFORD, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry Grand Army posts of Henderson, Plainview, Winona, Sauk Center, and Caledonia, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens and business firms of Winona, Minn., praying that an investigation be made relative to the existing conditions in the conduct of the Post Office Department, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Modern Brotherhood of America, of Wadena, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mails as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. NELSON. I present a memorial of the National Editorial Association, of Hutchinson, Kans.; the American Envelope Manufacturers' Association, of St. Louis, Mo.; the International Association of Photo-Engravers, of Washington, D. C.; the National Association of Stationers and Manufacturers, of New York City, N. Y.; the National Paper Trade Association, of Washington, D. C.; the Printers' League of America, of New York City, N. Y.; and of the United Typothetae of America, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes.

I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DICK presented petitions of sundry members of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Stryker, Prairie Depot, Clyde, Edison, McArthur, Delaware, Bloomville, Convoys, Rarden, Flushing, Marysville, Morgan County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 234, Metal Polishers' Union, of Fremont; of Local Union No. 129, Journeymen Barbers' Union, of Cleveland; of Local Union No. 307, International Union of Steam Engineers, of Lorain; of Local Union No. 24, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of

Wellsville; and of Local Union No. 1, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of Toronto, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 5, of Columbus, Ohio, and of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Local Camp No. 28, Woodmen of the World, of Wapakoneta; of Local Lodge No. 1040, of Akron; of Local Lodge No. 213, of Van Wert; and of Local Lodge No. 951, of Toledo, all of the Modern Brotherhood of America, in the State of Ohio; and of Local Lodge No. 438, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the farmers' institute of Frankford, Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made for the extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairfield County, Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Hocking River, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Local Union No. 117, Bartenders' Protective and Benevolent League, of Belleville, Ill., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wing and Aurora, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Watseka, Polo, Bradford, Paxton, Greenville, Batavia, and Prophetstown, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twelfth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota. A concurrent resolution, by Mr. McLean.

Whereas the free distribution of garden seeds, flower seeds, and bulbs has come to be looked upon as a vast expenditure of money annually without adequate recompense, seeds being distributed promiscuously by our Senators and Congressmen generally far removed from places where grown, hence are not suited to climate or soil conditions, and are therefore no material benefit, besides incumbering our Senators and Representatives with a vast amount of unnecessary trouble and labor: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of North Dakota (the house concurring). That it believes the expenditure of approximately the sum of \$500,000 annually for the free distribution of the various kinds of garden seeds is uncalled for and unnecessary and should be abolished, unless for the propagation and distribution of the various kinds of grasses and clover seed: be it further

Resolved. That the secretary of the senate and the chief clerk of the house be, and they are hereby, instructed to mail a copy of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This is to certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution originated in the senate and was concurred in by the house of representatives of the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota.

USHER L. BURDICK,
President of the Senate.

J. B. HANLY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Local Union No. 785, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of Elkins, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the West Virginia State Horticultural Society, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the quarantining and inspecting of all nursery stock, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BURROWS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Frankenmuth, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Michigan Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the publication of all the archives of the Government relating to the War of the Revolution, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Second District Dental Society, of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of dental surgeons in the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Reading Club, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products, for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of local Grand Army posts and of sundry citizens of Jackson, Marshall, Three Rivers, Mason, Vassar, Lyons, Saginaw, Marquette, Davison, Saugatuck, Milan, Harbor Springs, Kalkaska, Colon, Hastings, Morenci, Bloomingdale, Buchanan, Mancelona, Sanford, Marcellus, Otsego, Hemlock, Albion, Olivet, Lawton, Mayville, Mendon, Saline, Three Oaks, Scotts, Portland, Allegan, Detroit, Sherwood, North Branch, and Cassopolis, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of local lodges, Modern Brotherhood of America, of Flint, Cooks, Harbor Beach, Detroit, Adrian, Marquette, Grand Lodge, Escanaba, Birmingham, Elsie, Owosso, Alpena, Linden, Michigamme, Port Huron, Brown City, Trenton, Pontiac, Jackson, Mount Clemens, Grand Rapids, Eau Claire, Colema, Sears, Buckley, Hubbell, Wyandotte, and Daggett; and of local lodges, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Traverse City and Port Huron; and of local camps, Woodmen of the World, of Marquette and Bay City, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of sundry citizens of Addy, Chewelah, Colville, Connell, Cunningham, Dayton, Deer Park, Kennewick, Kettle Falls, Lind, Pasco, and Walla Walla, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. YOUNG presented a petition of the City Council of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and a petition of sundry railway postal clerks of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an improvement in the Railway Mail Service of the country, and also for an increase in the wages of railway mail clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. DAVIS. I present telegrams, in the nature of petitions, from the Business Men's League and the Board of Trade of Helena, Ark., and the Buckeye Oil Co., of Little Rock, Ark., relative to the Canadian reciprocity agreement. The telegrams are short, and I move that they be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELENA, ARK., January 30, 1911.

Senator JEFF DAVIS, Washington, D. C.:

Canadian reciprocity agreement puts cottonseed oil on free list. Request that you advocate ratification if you can consistently do so.
BUSINESS MEN'S LEAGUE.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 28, 1911.

Hon. JEFF DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Canadian reciprocity agreement puts cottonseed oil on the free list and reduces other duties in which our industry is interested. Please advocate ratification as strongly as you find consistent. The short time remaining and our vital interest in this matter force us to beg that you give this immediate attention.

THE BUCKEYE COTTON OIL CO.

HELENA, ARK., January 30, 1911.

Senator JEFF DAVIS, Washington, D. C.:

The Canadian reciprocity agreement contemplates placing cottonseed oil on free list, and we respectfully request that you insist upon ratification, as it is greatly to the interest of this State.

HELENA BOARD OF TRADE,
JOS. L. SOLOMAN, President.

Mr. TERRELL. I present a petition from the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, relative to the general parcels-post bill. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. Office of Secretary-Treasurer, Texarkana, Tex.]

To the Senate of the United States:

We, the national officers and State presidents of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, who have been delegated to represent 39 States, with a membership of 3,000,000, respectfully petition and ask your honorable body to pass a general parcels-post bill and will ever pray.

C. S. BARRETT,
President Farmers' Educational and
Cooperative Union of America.
W. R. CALLICOTTE,
Vice President National Union.
A. C. DAVIS,
Secretary Treasurer National Union.

Mr. CURTIS. I present resolutions adopted by the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Library.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men at its annual session held in Toledo, Ohio, on September 15, 1910:

Be it resolved by the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, That the Government and the people of the United States of America owe to the American Indian an everlasting debt of gratitude; that said debt can be best discharged at this late day by erecting in their honor and memory a great American Indian memorial and museum building, in which to house and preserve the evidences of their former existence, history, and characteristics, now going to decay throughout our land; that the further failure of our American Government to take action in this regard might be construed by enlightened nations as national ingratitude; and be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Great Council, in national council assembled, and representing more than a half million patriotic citizens of America, that the Government of the United States should without delay erect, establish, equip, and maintain a proper, fitting, and adequate Indian memorial building and museum, and therein conserve and preserve the various articles of Indian husbandry, warfare, and the chase, together with the legends, history, and other evidences of the manners, customs, and characteristics of the American Indian, in order that the world through all ages may have a proper conception of the lofty character, personal integrity, religious conceptions, and the true life of that mighty race whom we as American citizens have driven before us in the march of progress to their last stand, now fading away; and be it further

Resolved, That the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men shall and does hereby petition the President and the Congress of the United States of America to establish, equip, and maintain such an American Indian memorial and museum as here indicated; that in this behalf the Improved Order of Red Men, through this, its national representative body, hereby tenders and pledges to the Government of the United States its service in whatever way and measure may lie within its power, to the end that proper gratitude may be shown to the memory of the noble red man; and be it further

Resolved, That suitably prepared copies of these resolutions be presented to the President and the Congress of the United States at such time and in such manner as may be determined by the great chiefs of this Great Council, and that the said great chiefs shall use every honorable endeavor to promulgate this proposition as shall be deemed necessary and expedient in the premises.

GEO. B. GRIGGS, *Great Inchohonce.*

Attest:
[SEAL.]

WILSON BROOKS,
Great Chief of Records.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a telegram from the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., January 30, 1911.

HON. CHARLES CURTIS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby notified that both houses of the Kansas Legislature to-day adopted a resolution indorsing San Francisco as the site for the proposed Panama Canal celebration of 1915.

WALTER A. JOHNSON,
Secretary of Senate.
EARL DOUGLASS,
Assistant Chief Clerk of House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. I present house joint memorial No. 3, of the eleventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the granting of lands embraced in the abandoned Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to Whitman College. I ask that the joint memorial be printed in the RECORD and ordered to lie on the table, as the matter referred to was incorporated in Senate bill 3196, which has passed the Senate and is now on the House Calendar.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, prays that the land and buildings comprising the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation and Barracks may be granted to Whitman College. The reasons deemed sufficient to justify this memorial are set forth in the following statement:

The War Department has determined that the military service does not require the maintenance of a military post at Fort Walla Walla, and the troops have been withdrawn, except a few necessary caretakers, so that in future the preservation of the property will be a burden upon the Government, without any compensating benefit.

The property is, by reason of its situation and character, adapted to the needs of Whitman College, its use by the college will be the best use to which it can be devoted, and the Nation will derive the greatest benefit from the property by intrusting it to an institution in every way worthy and capable of using it in the cause of higher education.

There is within the boundaries of the reservation a soldiers' cemetery containing the graves of a number of men who died while in the military service of the United States. This cemetery has been well kept by the officers and soldiers heretofore stationed at Fort Walla Walla, and if the prayer of your memorialist shall be granted the trustees of Whitman College will assume an obligation to so care for this soldiers' cemetery as to show perpetually the respect due to our country's defenders.

Texas and Hawaii became annexed to the United States without contributing anything to the wealth of the Nation as a land proprietor, and other acquisitions of territory, except the Oregon country, were purchased and paid for out of the National Treasury, but more than 300,000 square miles of country, comprising the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming, became part of our national domain through the instrumentality of patriotic pioneers, of whom Dr. Marcus Whitman was a type and a leader. They penetrated the wilderness and wrested that country with its wealth of land, forests, mines, waters, and fisheries from the grasp of a foreign corporation, and held it until the growth of the public sentiment forced the Government to bring to a conclusion the diplomatic controversy with respect to its ownership by the treaty with Great Britain of 1846, whereby the American title was finally recognized and established.

The scene of one of the tragedies of American history is in the immediate vicinity of Fort Walla Walla. There a monument commemorates the lives of Dr. Whitman and his wife and a dozen of their associates, part of the vanguard of American civilization, who were massacred by the aboriginal inhabitants. Our Nation loves to honor those whose names illuminate the pages of its history. For that purpose the Government has willingly expended liberal appropriations in payment for statuary, monuments, and paintings produced by the most talented artists of the world, and the granting of Fort Walla Walla as a contribution to the college founded by an intimate friend and coworker of Dr. Whitman to honor his memory, and which has appealed to the sentiment of public-spirited, patriotic citizens, bringing responses in liberal contributions to its endowment, will be heartily approved by the people at large. In return for the national aggrandizement resulting directly from the exertion, privations, and sacrifices of the Oregon pioneers, the Nation can well afford to bestow one section of land and the buildings which it does not require for use as a gift to an institution of learning which the people of the three Northwestern States have adopted as an object of their solicitude and pride.

Whitman College is a privately endowed, nonsectarian, Christian college, intended to supply the need of those States for such an institution of higher education. It commands the respect and has the earnest sympathy of learned people and good people in every section of the United States, and its destiny is to grow in importance as the country surrounding it shall advance in all ways that mark the development of arts and sciences. No more fitting monument has been erected, nor to a worthier man.

The State of Washington and its citizens have paid for and donated to the United States the land comprised within two military posts, viz. Fort Lawton, near Seattle, and Fort Wright, near Spokane, each including more than 1,000 acres. These lands were purchased after they became valuable and after they had been selected for military use, and the acquisition thereof for the use of the Government involved labor and patience on the part of the public-spirited citizens in soliciting contributions of land and money, in overcoming objections of owners, and their present value is many times greater than the highest estimate of the value of Fort Walla Walla.

Therefore your said memorialist earnestly recommends the passage of the said resolution, and represents that the State of Idaho desires the granting of the land and buildings of the said Fort Walla Walla Military Reserve be made to Whitman College.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 23d day of January, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the Senate on the 24th day of January, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

This memorial received by the governor on the 25th day of January, 1911, at 11.20 o'clock, and approved on the 25th day of January, 1911.

JAMES H. HAWLEY, *Governor.*

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 3 originated in the house of representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho during the eleventh session.

JAMES H. WALLIS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, W. L. Gifford, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 3, by Black and Galloway, recommending the passage of a resolution granting what is known as Fort Walla Walla Military Reserve and buildings thereon to Whitman College in the State of Washington.

Passed the house January 23, 1911.
Passed the senate January 24, 1911.

Which was filed in this office the 25th day of January, A. D. 1911, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 26th day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

W. L. GIFFORD, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BURNHAM presented petitions of Louis Bell Post, No. 3, of Manchester; George A. Gay Post, No. 18, of Newmarket; and George F. Sweatt Post, No. 38, of Franklin, all of the Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the battleship *New York* to be built in a Government navy yard, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. RAYNER presented petitions of Local Councils of Habnab, Brunswick, and Tilghman, all of the Junior Order of American Mechanics, and of Washington Camp No. 12, Patriotic Sons of America, of Unionville, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of Archer Post, No. 28, of Princeton; Sol Meredith Post, of Richmond; H. D. Washburn Post, No. 220, of Dana; Samuel Ried Post, No. 87, of Salem; C. R. Owen Post, of Clinton; Post No. 51, of Monticello; Windfall Post, of Windfall; Custer Post, No. 232, of Wakarusa; Lookout Post, of Noblesville; B. J. Crosswaite Post, No. 150, of Angola; Bryant Post, No. 62, of Williamsport; New Castle Post, of New Castle; Oxford Post, of Oxford; Williams Post, of Muncie; Shiloh Field Post, of Elkhart; Masters Post, No. 120, of Boonville; R. M. Kelly Post, No. 217, of Edinburg; Gordon Tanner Post, of Brownstown; Sol. D. Kempton Post, No. 228, of Fortville; Sion S. Bass Post, No. 40, of Fort Wayne; Gaskins Post, of Farmersburg; Nathan Kimball Post, No. 192, of Linton; Samuel H. Dunbar Post, No. 92, of Greenfield; Thomas Harrison Post, No. 30, of Kokomo; Nelson Trusler Post, of Winchester; Jasper Packard Post, No. 589, of La Fayette; James R. Slack Post, No. 137, of Huntington; Sam. Henry Post, No. 63, of Decatur; Benj. J. Spooner Post, No. 586, of Yorkville; Post No. 126, of Connorsville; General Shunk Post, No. 23, of Marion, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, of the State of Indiana; and of veteran soldiers' meeting, of Vincennes; William Price and 171 other citizens, of Upland; Ex-Soldiers and Sailors Association, of Elkhart; John C. Nelson, of Logansport; M. M. Gustus, of Bluffton; Edward Tuhey, mayor of Muncie; J. C. Scheffler, of Wolcottville, all of the State of Indiana; and of Lieut. C. W. Hartup, of Eagle Pass, Tex., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Missouri to the Congress of the United States, asking for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby requested to submit to the legislatures of the various States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people of the various States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit copies of this memorial to Senator WILLIAM JOEL STONE and the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, with the request that they present the same to the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively.

Mr. STONE. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas it is now contemplated to celebrate the completion of the great Panama Canal by a world's exposition of its resources, developments, and achievements, in the year 1915; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill providing for a governmental supervision of said exposition and

designating the city of New Orleans, La., as the place for holding the same; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans is the natural gateway for the great river commerce of the Mississippi and its tributaries, and the holding of such an exposition will greatly tend to attract national attention to the necessity for river improvement in the Mississippi Valley; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans is more accessible to the greater number of citizens of the United States, and its citizens have always been in the forefront of every movement seeking to improve river navigation and commerce, and likewise contributed actively and generously to the success of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, recently held in the State of Missouri: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Missouri (the house concurring therein), That the United States Senators and Members of Congress from Missouri be urgently requested, one and all, to vote for the city of New Orleans as the place for holding the world's Panama Exposition, and to use their influence for the same.

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house transmit a copy of these resolutions to every Senator and Representative from this State.

We, the undersigned, Robert S. McClintic, secretary of the senate, and J. Kelly Pool, chief clerk of the house of representatives, of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Missouri, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution offered in the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives, as shown by the journals of our respective houses.

Witness our hand at Jefferson City, Mo., this 26th day of January, 1911.

ROBERT S. MCCLINTIC,

Secretary of the Senate.

J. KELLY POOL,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 10375) to authorize Hamilton County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn. (Rept. No. 1027); and

A bill (S. 10410) to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala. (Rept. No. 1028).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 10431) to authorize the Argenta Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta, Ark., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1029) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 30th instant, relative to the settlement of certain sums advanced by the States of Virginia and Maryland in 1790 and 1791 to the United States, used toward the erection of public buildings in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed, which was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 9204) for the relief of George T. Hamilton, submitted an adverse report (No. 1030) thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 7638) for the relief of Belvedere Steele, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1031) thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 25081) for the relief of Helen S. Hogan, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1032) thereon.

THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. GALLINGER. I report back favorably from the Committee on the District of Columbia without amendment the bill (S. 10361) to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] to the bill.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Louis Wagner, of Pennsylvania; Robert B. Beath, of Pennsylvania; Samuel S. Burdett, of the District of Columbia; WILLIAM WARNER, of Missouri; James Tanner, of New York; Robert B. Brown, of Ohio; Samuel R. Van Sant, of Minnesota; John E. Gilman, of Massachusetts; Allan C. Bakewell, of New York; Grenville M. Dodge, of Iowa; Claire E. Adams, of Nebraska; William A. Ketcham, of Indiana; Alfred B. Beers, of Connecticut; Bernard Kelly, of Kansas; Thomas S. Hopkins, of the District of Columbia; and the commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, ex officio, during his term of office, together with such persons as they may associate with themselves, and their successors, be, and they hereby are, constituted and created a body corporate of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. That the name of such body corporate shall be the Grand Army of the Republic, and by that name it shall have perpetual succession.

Sec. 3. That the purposes and objects of said corporation shall be as follows:

First. To preserve and strengthen those kind and fraternal feelings which bind together the soldiers, sailors, and marines who united to suppress the late rebellion, and to perpetuate the memory and history of the dead.

Second. To assist such former comrades in arms as need help and protection, and to extend needful aid to the widows and orphans of those who have fallen.

Third. To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, based upon a paramount respect for and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to discountenance whatever tends to weaken loyalty, incite to insurrection, treason, or rebellion, or in any manner impairs the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; and to encourage the spread of universal liberty, equal rights, and justice to all men.

Sec. 4. That the said corporation shall have power to make and alter from time to time such by-laws, rules, and regulations, not in conflict with the laws of the United States, as it may deem proper as to its members and their qualifications and rights and the manner in which they may act and vote by proxy or otherwise, and as to the titles, qualifications, and duties of its officers, directors, or trustees, and the times and manner of their election, and their terms of office, and as to the mode of acquiring and of losing membership in said corporation, and as to the mode of conducting and promoting the affairs and purposes of the said corporation, and as to all the matters within the objects hereinbefore stated.

Sec. 5. That the members of the corporation shall not be less than 5 in number and not more than 25, as may be prescribed by the by-laws of the corporation: *Provided*, That if and when the number of members shall be less than 5 the members remaining shall have power to add and shall add to their number until the number shall not be less than 5: *And provided*, That no act of the corporation shall be void because at the time such act shall be done the number of the members of the corporation shall be less than 5; that all the members of the corporation shall be its trustees; that no member of the said corporation shall, by reason of such membership or his trusteeship, be personally liable for any of its debts or obligations; that each member of the corporation shall hold his membership for a term of five years and until his successor shall be chosen: *Provided, however*, That the members shall be at all times divided into three classes, equal numerically as nearly as may be, and that the original members shall at their first meeting, or as soon thereafter as shall be convenient, be divided into three classes, the members of the first class to hold their membership and office until the expiration of one year, the members of the second class until the expiration of three years, and the members of the third class until the expiration of five years from the 30th day of June next after the enactment of this law, and that in every case the member shall hold office after the expiration of his term until his successor shall be chosen: *And provided further*, That in case any member shall, by death, resignation, incapacity to act, or otherwise, cease to be a member during his term, his successor may be chosen to serve for the remainder of such term and until his successor shall be chosen.

Sec. 6. That the said corporation may take or receive, whether by gift, grant, devise, bequest, or purchase, any real or personal estate, and to hold, grant, convey, hire, or lease the same, for the purposes of its incorporation, and to accept and administer any trust of real or personal estate for any purpose within the objects of the incorporation.

Sec. 7. That the said corporation may have and use a common seal and alter and change the same at its pleasure.

Sec. 8. That the principal office of the said corporation shall be in the District of Columbia, but offices may be maintained, and meetings of the corporation, the trustees, and committees may be held in such other places as the by-laws may from time to time designate.

Sec. 9. That this charter shall be subject to alteration, amendment, or repeal at the pleasure of the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 10576) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Lutes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 10577) for the relief of the Southern Railway Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEVERIDGE:

A bill (S. 10578) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Dunnington;

A bill (S. 10579) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth R. Bringham; and

A bill (S. 10580) granting an increase of pension to John Martindale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 10581) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try, adjudicate, and determine the claim of Col. Theodore T. S. Laidley, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 10582) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico;" to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 10583) to amend the charter of the Firemen's Insurance Co. of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 10584) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW., between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street, and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WARNER:

A bill (S. 10585) providing for the purchase of a site in the District of Columbia, the erection of a pedestal, and the placing thereon of a suitable equestrian statue in honor of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 10586) to authorize the Chicago Great Western Railroad Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 10587) granting an increase of pension to James H. Thompson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 10588) granting an increase of pension to John A. West (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 10589) for the relief of Capt. John J. Clark (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 10590) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a dam across the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 10591) to grant certain lands to the city of Trinidad, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 10592) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Graham; and

A bill (S. 10593) granting a pension to Susan M. Summer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 10594) to authorize S. G. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison, Kans.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BURKETT submitted an amendment providing that hereafter librarians in the public schools of the District of Columbia are made eligible to classes 4 and 5, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment relative to the retirement of the five medical officers of the Army who served creditably as contract or acting assistant surgeons in or with the Army during the Civil War prior to April 9, 1865, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,500 for macadamizing the Georgetown and Alexandria Road along the eastern boundary of the Arlington National Cemetery, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$75,000 for the construction of a public road from a point near the southern end of the new Highway Bridge across the Potomac River to a point on or near the southern boundary line of the Arlington reservation, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS TO SURVIVORS OF THE MEXICAN AND CIVIL WARS.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to House bill 29346 granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico. The amendment is in conformity with the platforms of both political parties in my own and in many other States. I move that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 29346) granting pensions to

certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of House bill 28632, appropriating money for rivers and harbors.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 28632) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. FRYE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall first receive consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

Improving Exeter River, N. H.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1090, Sixty-first Congress, third session, \$9,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

Improving Connecticut River, Conn., below Hartford, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1294, Sixty-first Congress, third session, \$77,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$100,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 5, to insert:

Improving harbor at Buffalo, N. Y.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to apply from appropriations heretofore made for repairing and rebuilding breakwaters and for maintenance of structures \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to the completion of the Stony Point Breakwater.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 3, to insert:

Improving Potomac River at Alexandria, Va.: Completing improvement, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 9, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "sixty," so as to make the clause read:

Improving harbor at Brunswick, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving St. Johns River, Fla.: Continuing improvement from Jacksonville to the ocean, \$425,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated; continuing improvement from Palatka to Lake Harney, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 18, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into contract with the Ragland Water Power Co., hereinafter designated "the contracting party," to complete the dam which has been partially constructed by the Government at said Lock No. 4 on the Coosa River, the work to be done under his supervision and control, and in accordance with the present adopted project and any modification thereof that he may deem proper: *Provided*, That the contracting party shall furnish all materials, of every character, and pay for all labor required in the construction of said dam, which, upon completion, shall become the property of the United States, free of all costs, claims, or charges of any kind whatsoever: *Provided further*, That the terms of this act and any stipulation which the Secretary of War may deem necessary to safeguard the interests of navigation and other interests of the United States shall be embodied in any contract entered into as aforesaid. The contracting party shall begin the said work within two years from the approval of this act, and shall complete the same within four years from the date of commencing construction, and the Secretary of War may, upon reasonable diligence of the contracting party being shown, extend the time for completion, the Government reserving the right to commence and finish the work, if deemed advisable, at any time before it is commenced by the contracting party; or, if begun and not carried out in strict conformity to the directions of the Secretary of War, the Government may assume the completion of said work at its option, the cost of such completion to be paid by the contracting party: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall de-

termine from time to time whether the work is being properly done. In consideration of the completion of said dam free of cost to the Government, the contracting party is hereby granted such rights as the Government possesses to use the water power produced by said dam for manufacturing and other industrial purposes for a period of 99 years: *Provided*, That the plans for the necessary works and structures to utilize said water power shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the right is reserved to the United States to construct, maintain, and operate a forebay and lock for navigation purposes in connection with said dam, and nothing shall be done in the use of the water from said dam or otherwise to interfere with or in any way impede or retard the operation of said lock or the proper and complete navigation of the river at all times, nor in any way to interfere with the use and control of the same by the United States or the maintenance of the water surface above the dam at the established pool level; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to prescribe regulations to govern the use of the said water power and the operations of the plant and force employed in connection therewith; and no claim shall be made against the United States for any failure of water power, resulting from any cause whatsoever: *Provided further*, That the contracting party shall furnish to the United States, free of cost, such electric current as may be necessary for operating the Government lock, in case the same shall be built, and lighting its buildings and grounds: *And provided further*, That the contracting party may have ingress and egress over Government lands in the construction and operation of the plant. The Secretary of War may require the contracting party to execute a bond, with proper securities, before the commencement of the work, in such amount as he may consider necessary to insure the beginning, prosecution, and completion of the work and compliance with the terms and requirements of this act, and in case of failure to comply with the requirements of said bond, the contracting party shall forfeit to the United States the full amount thereof: *Provided*, That a suitable force of inspectors shall be employed on the work by the Secretary of War, at the expense of the United States, to see that the plans and specifications and the terms and requirements of the act and the conditions of the contract are strictly carried out, and any expense incurred by the United States in maintaining said inspectors shall be paid from any funds available pertaining to the appropriation made by Congress for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors. Congress reserves the right to revoke the rights and privileges conferred by this act, but in the event of such revocation, the United States shall pay to the contracting party, as full compensation, the reasonable value, exclusive of any franchise that may be acquired under this act, of all properties erected and lands purchased by them necessary for the enjoyment of the benefits hereby conferred, such value to be determined by mutual agreement of the Secretary of War and the owners of said properties, and in case they can not agree, then by proceedings in condemnation to be instituted in the proper United States court: *Provided*, That to insure the compliance with the terms of this contract, or to protect the interests of navigation and other interests of the United States, the Secretary of War shall have power, at any time before or after the completion of the work, to order a suspension of all privileges granted by this act, and a compliance with such order may be enforced by an injunction of the court of the United States exercising jurisdiction in the district in which the work is situated, and proper proceedings to this end shall be instituted by the Attorney General, upon request of the Secretary of War. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way abridging the exclusive jurisdiction and control by the United States of the Coosa River, and of any structure therein, or as repealing or modifying any of the provisions or laws now existing for the protection of navigation.

The contracting party in consideration of the privileges granted hereby must, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may require, obligate and bind themselves to raise the height of said dam at Lock No. 4 3 feet, and shall stop the leaks above Dam No. 4 by which water escapes under such dam, so far as the same can be done, and to keep said leaks stopped so far as it is possible to do so. In consideration of making said improvements, the said contracting party shall have the right to raise said dam during low water to such a height as may be necessary to give it a storage basin above the dam, in order that they may develop and operate a water power: *Provided*, That the said storage does not interfere with navigation: *And provided further*, That the said contracting party shall pay all damage incurred by reason of overflowed lands. Beginning with the year 1925, the contracting party shall pay for the power due to the natural flowage of the river the sum of \$1 per 10-hour horsepower per year: *And provided further*, That in case the natural flowage of the river is increased at this point by storage reservoirs above this point, the power company shall have the right to lease, for a period of 99 years, the increased power due to said storage, and shall pay on all power above that due to natural flowage of the river, as increased by local storage at Dam No. 4, the sum of \$1 for five years, \$2 for five years, and thereafter \$3 per year for each 10-hour horsepower sold, or in lieu of above payment may pay its equitable share toward construction of said reservoir or reservoirs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 7, after the words "Ship Island Pass," to strike out "\$40,000. The U. S. dredge *Barnard*" and insert "\$100,000, of which amount \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for the repair and modification of the U. S. dredge *Barnard*, which," so as to make the clause read:

Improving harbor at Gulfport, Miss.: For maintenance of improvement of anchorage basin at Gulfport and channel therefrom to the anchorage or roadstead at Ship Island, and for the improvement and maintenance of channel at Ship Island Pass, \$100,000, of which amount \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for the repair and modification of the U. S. dredge *Barnard*, which is hereby transferred and assigned to Gulfport Harbor and Channel for use and to be operated in accordance with the provisions and recommendations contained in the report printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 2, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 8, to insert:

Inland waterway between Franklin and Mermentau, La.: To insure the selection of the most suitable route for the inland waterway chan-

nel from Franklin to Mermonteau adopted by Congress in the river and harbor act of March 2, 1907, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, to make such changes in the location of said channel as may be considered desirable: *Provided*, That no change shall be made under this authorization unless the necessary right of way is secured to the United States free of cost.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 7, to insert:

For the construction of a deep-water harbor or port within the entrance to Aransas Pass, at Harbor Island, Tex., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1904, Sixty-first Congress, third session, \$125,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law not to exceed in the aggregate \$250,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided further*, That a satisfactory right of way be furnished the United States free of cost: *And provided further*, That the State of Texas, through its proper officers, shall satisfy the Secretary of War that the interests of the general public are duly protected and that no terminal monopoly will be possible.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 21, to insert:

Improving the Sabine-Neches Canal, Texas, from the Port Arthur Ship Canal to the mouth of the Sabine River, the Neches River up to the town of Beaumont, and the Sabine River up to the town of Orange, to a navigable depth of 25 feet, in accordance with plan No. 4, submitted in House Document No. 1290, Sixty-first Congress, third session, as follows:

For sections "a" and "c" from Port Arthur Ship Canal to mouth of Neches River and from mouth of Neches River to Beaumont, \$150,000; and the Secretary of War may enter into contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete said sections to an amount not exceeding \$706,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated, of which amount not exceeding \$278,000 shall be paid from appropriations to be hereafter made by law and the remainder from funds contributed by the Beaumont navigation district or other local interests: *Provided*, That no part of these amounts shall be expended and no contract shall be entered into until the Beaumont navigation district, a local organization created and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, or other local interests, shall have placed in some United States depository, to be selected by the Secretary of War, the sum of \$428,000 to the credit of the Secretary of War, to be expended by him in equal amounts with moneys provided by the United States in prosecuting this work: *Provided further*, That said Beaumont navigation district or other local interests shall become bound, in manner satisfactory to the Secretary of War, to maintain said channel free of cost to the United States for a term of three years after the completion thereof, and to provide for the operation and maintenance of the guard lock without cost to the United States until otherwise provided by law, all in accordance with the recommendations in the report cited above: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contract for work on sections "a" and "c", at any time after the local interests have provided the moneys as above specified, independent of and without reference to section "b."

For section "b," \$50,000; and the Secretary of War may enter into contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete said section to an amount not exceeding \$237,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated, of which amount not exceeding \$93,500 shall be paid from appropriations to be hereafter made by law and the remainder from funds contributed by the Orange navigation district or other local interests: *Provided*, That no part of these amounts shall be expended and no contract shall be entered into until the Orange navigation district or other local interests shall have placed in some United States depository, to be selected by the Secretary of War, the sum of \$143,500 to the credit of the Secretary of War, to be expended by him in equal amounts with moneys provided by the United States in prosecuting this work: *Provided further*, That said Orange navigation district or other local interests shall become bound, in manner satisfactory to the Secretary of War, to maintain said channel free of cost to the United States for a term of three years, all in accordance with the recommendations in the report cited above.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to oppose this amendment, and in the same connection to offer some general criticisms upon the pending bill, and to call particular attention to two Senate amendments. This bill is far less objectionable than the act of last year, in approving which the President transmitted to Congress a memorandum of objections based upon divers specific provisions and criticising the general policy exemplified by it.

The present measure, however, unlike that of a year ago, does not include a large number of provisions for extensive improvements in which a mere fraction of the amount required is appropriated. The objections to that method are perfectly obvious. In the first place, where improvements costing millions of dollars receive appropriations of a few hundred thousand, there is no ground for expectation of completed results. In the next place, it is very easy to make these partial appropriations for great projects without a sufficient amount of deliberation upon the importance of the project which is adopted.

I regard this pending amendment as especially objectionable. Its purpose is to make seaports of two towns well in the interior, which must be reached partly by canals, artificially constructed, and partly by the improvement of rivers unfit for ocean navigation. When the two towns of Orange and Beaumont are finally reached as a result of these improvements, there is sure to be insufficient room for anchorage purposes.

There is another objection to each of these projects. We already have an expensive improvement, costing \$4,000,000, below

this projected improvement at Sabine Pass and Port Arthur. There has already been expended on those two improvements the sum of \$4,000,000. In a report filed by the Engineer Department last year it appeared that in order to obtain a suitable channel 25 feet in depth to Sabine Pass and Port Arthur an expenditure of \$2,300,000 would be required, a part of this to repair and strengthen jetties extending 4 miles out into the Gulf, and a part for the improvement of the channel from the mouth of the Pass to Port Arthur.

What is the policy displayed in this bill? It apparently is to neglect those seaports now accommodating a large traffic with channels and means of approach that are entirely inadequate; it is to leave them with channels scarcely 25 feet in depth, while going into the interior up natural or artificial channels 26 miles to Orange and 36 miles to Beaumont in the vain endeavor to secure ports at those two points. Every principle of business-like policy, every idea of thoroughness would demand that the ports already in use be raised to a reasonable stage of efficiency before we seek to extend these improvements farther into the interior.

I object again to the precedent established by this amendment. It means that wherever there is a stream flowing into the Gulf or into the ocean the Government must undertake the task of providing deep water for ocean-going ships to some interior point. Except for one or two experiments tried in this very locality, except for a channel 5½ miles in length to Houston and one some 12 or 15 miles in length to Port Arthur, such an experiment is without precedent in the ports of the world. If we carry deep water to Beaumont and Orange, part of the way by an artificial channel, we ought also to do the same for Maine and carry deep water up the Penobscot to Bangor and up the Kennebec to Augusta. Passing on to Connecticut we ought to carry deep water up the Connecticut River about 50 miles to Hartford, and so all along the line, possibly carrying a channel for ocean-going ships up to Fayetteville, on the Cape Fear River in North Carolina, and up the Santee and its branch, the Congaree, to Columbia, in South Carolina. The plain fact is that it is utterly impracticable to make a convenient and useful port of an inland point of this nature.

Again, let us consider the question as it is presented to us by the engineers. They reported, at first, that a channel 100 feet in width could be obtained through the artificial portions at an expense of \$1,845,000, but they advised very strongly against any such attempt being made. A measure somewhat similar to this was added to the river and harbor bill by a Senate amendment last year, and in conference a compromise was reached providing for a further examination.

I wish to read the provisions of that compromise:

The Secretary of War shall appoint a board of engineers to reconsider the project submitted in House Document No. 836, Sixty-first Congress, second session, for the improvement of the Sabine-Neches Canal from the Port Arthur Ship Canal to the mouth of the Sabine River, the Neches River up to the town of Beaumont, and the Sabine River up to the town of Orange, to a navigable depth of 25 feet, including a guard lock, and report to Congress on or before December 1, 1910, upon the dimensions and cost of the minimum improvement of the locality which will adequately serve the interests of commerce and the amounts which the United States and the local interests, respectively, should contribute toward the cost of such adequate improvement and toward its maintenance after completion. In view of the fact that more extensive cooperation on the part of the local interests in construction and for maintenance is now proposed than was considered in the report heretofore submitted, the board is especially directed to confer with the representatives of such local interests and to submit with its report, for the consideration of Congress, any proposition or propositions for local cooperation that may be presented: *Provided*, That the expenses of the board herein authorized shall be paid from the appropriation for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

This provision was inserted after an adverse report had previously been made by the Army engineers. I submit that this action was hardly fair to the corps of engineers. It was a decided intimation to them that their report previously made upon the project did not meet with the approval of Congress, and that in the next report to be made under this provision a favorable recommendation should be rendered. It eliminated the question of whether the project was desirable or not. The engineers were not to report upon that. Notwithstanding this intimation, amounting to a demand that a favorable report be transmitted to Congress on this project, Gen. Bixby, Chief of Engineers, in his report says:

Although liberal cooperation by local interests, such as is offered in the present case, must be considered as a strong argument in favor of undertaking new improvements, I am constrained to state that, in view of the limited facilities which will be afforded by the improvements as proposed and the necessity for their ultimate enlargement if they are to serve efficiently a large commerce, it is my opinion that the improvement of the Sabine-Neches Canal from the Port Arthur Ship Canal to the mouth of the Sabine River, the Neches River up to the town of Beaumont, and the Sabine River up to the town of Orange to a navigable depth of 25 feet at an initial cost to the Government of \$571,500 and \$50,000 annually for maintenance after the expiration of three

years, in the manner described in plan 4 of the special board, is not at the present time necessary in the interest of navigation, and that the expenditure is justifiable only if Congress considers it wise to undertake the improvement in order to bring about more promptly the desired reduction of freight rates.

Three arguments are made for this improvement. The first is that the localities interested are to cooperate with the Federal Government. Mr. President, no one will more cordially recognize offers of cooperation by communities than I, but there is always this danger, that when a city or locality proposes to share in the expense Congress will be induced to adopt projects which otherwise would not be adopted at all. This project comes here in a very pleasing guise, because the communities offer to contribute \$571,500. But that should not make us overlook the manifest, yes, the vital objections to this proposition.

Another argument in support of this item is that there are storms along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, and that it is desirable that provision should be made so that vessels with traffic may reach and anchor at points in the interior. Mr. President, we have already answered that argument by taking over the Port Arthur Canal and making due provision for a port 10 miles in the interior, away from the cyclones of the Gulf.

Again, that argument has little validity, because if the traffic of the Gulf ports is to maintain its present prosperity and to increase, as it doubtless will, it is necessary in some of the most important locations to provide facilities for and depend upon shipments consigned to the very edge of the Gulf.

But in this case the answer is conclusive. If a port 10 miles in the interior will not protect against storms and gales, one 26 or 30 miles farther in the interior will all the more fail to give the adequate protection.

The real argument which seems to have been given here, however, is that there is a differential in freight rates in the State of Texas which would favor these cities of Beaumont and Orange if they became seaports.

Mr. President, it is with the utmost hesitancy that I criticize any adjustment of rates made by any State railway commission, but it is obvious that the conditions arising from the enforcement of certain differentials there are unnatural. From a point in the interior the rates to Beaumont and Orange were formerly 49 cents per 100 pounds; to Sabine or Port Arthur, where those shipments could be loaded upon boats, 55 cents per 100 pounds. I believe those figures have been lessened, perhaps to 35 and 41 or 39 and 45 cents.

In the first place, let us consider some illustrations of this system. From a point 700 miles in the interior the rate to Beaumont or Orange would be 49 cents, but to carry that same shipment some 30 miles farther to Port Arthur the rate would be 55 cents. In other words, the shipment of freight is brought within 30 miles—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. In just one moment. And then for carrying it the remaining 30 miles a charge is made altogether out of proportion to the general mileage rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BURTON. I would like to ask the Senator from Texas a question, in the first instance. I am not sure of the figure that has recently been adopted by the Texas Railroad Commission. What is it?

Mr. BAILEY. Without intending to be impolite to the Senator, I do not think that is any of the Senate's business. My purpose in rising was to ask the Senator from Ohio if the State of Texas, either through its commission or otherwise, can control the rates on commodities taken up outside of the State and brought into it or through it. The Senator recognizes that our State can not do that.

Mr. BURTON. This, however, is an intrastate rate.

Mr. BAILEY. We know the State can not control the interstate rate. Then I respectfully submit that it is none of Ohio's business what Texas does with matters which concern only her own people.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it may not be Ohio's business, but it is the business of Congress. The argument ought not to be made here that we enter upon an impossible scheme for developing a port merely to cure an abnormal adjustment of railroad rates, whether they are enforced by the State of Texas or by a railroad commission or by any other agency.

Look at it: They carry freight 700 miles for 39 or 40 cents, and then to carry it 30 miles farther to a shipping port they charge an additional 6 cents, which is altogether out of proportion to the general rate.

Let us consider what was done by the Texas railroad commission. In the year 1907 the request was made of Congress that a port be established at Port Bolivar just across the bay from Galveston. The argument was advanced very earnestly,

and I have no doubt very sincerely, that there was a differential in favor of Port Bolivar in railroad rates of about 6 cents, and that by improving that port the price obtained for commodities in the State of Texas would be higher. Partially yielding to this argument an amendment was added to the bill by the Senate providing for the improvement of the harbor at Port Bolivar. What did the Texas railroad commission do? Just as soon as there was deep water at Port Bolivar it raised the rate to the figure in force at Galveston, doing away with all the advantage that had been secured.

The question here presented is, are we, for the sake of adjusting rates, to enter upon this expensive experiment—and the term "experiment" flatters the project—when there are so many other weapons in the armory of the law that are amply sufficient to remedy such a situation? Such was the argument in favor of this port. Without it I do not think the proposition would merit serious consideration for one minute.

I submit, Mr. President, that it was hardly fair to the engineers to ask them to bring in a report upon this project under such conditions. The general rule—yes, the invariable rule—is to ask their opinion as to the feasibility and desirability of a project. But in this case that idea was excluded. A local board of five engineers examined the proposed waterway and naturally reported as they did, for they were commanded to stifle their own judgment. They were virtually required to submit a report and express sentiments favorable to the plan. The board of review in going over it, however, did not coincide with them in that favorable opinion. The Chief of Engineers, as seen in the passage I have read, did not concur in that favorable opinion.

Mr. President, in all our legislation we should be guided by two general principles, fairness and equality. That of equality we entirely ignore if we accept this proposition, because it comes to us without the recommendations of the engineers, which we rigidly require in every case. It is also contrary to the recommendation of the President in the memorandum which he submitted to us last year; it is contrary to every principle of equality between localities and between Members of the House and Senate.

But let us face this proposition as it is. Five hundred and seventy-one thousand five hundred dollars to be contributed by the locality, together with an equal amount to be contributed by the Federal Government, will construct a channel 25 feet in depth. The original report estimated the cost at \$1,845,000. What is the difference between the two projects? The first contemplated an artificial channel 100 feet in width. But they said down in the locality, "Oh, we can get along with less than that," and so in a canal of considerable length a revised plan was evolved for a channel 80 feet in width. Now, fancy what kind of a canal that is for an ocean-going boat!

Only 80 feet wide where there is no natural flow of water! Even under the original project the engineers stated that boats three or four hundred feet long, the minimum length for boats which could carry freight at an economical rate, could not move except with great difficulty.

Now, the proposition is to construct a channel 80 feet in width. What does that mean? That this is the mere beginning of appropriations which we shall be asked to make, and in the future in all those appropriations and in all expenses incurred in connection with this channel the locality will not participate, but the Federal Government must bear the whole burden.

Mr. President, I submit this provision here is an excrescence on the bill. I might read at length from reports of the Chief of Engineers and others, but I have stated the general facts with reference to it. With the consent of the Senate, I may add certain other selections from the reports. I will read a few briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. The report of the Chief of Engineers contains the following:

The board states that while it may be possible for vessels of moderate size to navigate slowly the smaller channel proposed, unless provision were made for the larger class of vessels it would be of little more value than the present barge canal, and at least three cut-offs in addition to those proposed by the district officer will be required.

The local engineer in the first report expressed the following view:

It is hard to find reasons to justify the construction of this deep-water channel by the Central Government when the fact as to whether the improvement will reduce freight rates or not rests entirely in the hands of a railroad commission organized under the laws of a smaller political unit of the General Government.

It is not believed that the improvement, although it means much to Beaumont and Orange, would be felt beyond a radius of 25 miles from these cities.

From this, and the fact that a deep channel should not be dredged without providing some means whereby the rice-growing industry can

be protected from the dangers of salt water, I can not recommend that this project be undertaken by the General Government, with or without assistance in a financial way from the cities of Beaumont and Orange, at the present time.

The board of reviews in the last report made the following statement:

If the work under consideration were certain to secure the expected benefits, and were the only way of bringing them about; and, furthermore, if Congress should decide that the improvement of a waterway is advisable when the main purpose is to reduce railroad rates, then the expense involved would appear to be justified. In view of all the circumstances, however, the board is of the opinion that the improvement of the Sabine-Neches Canal from the Port Arthur Ship Canal to the mouth of the Sabine River, the Neches River up to the town of Beaumont, and the Sabine River up to the town of Orange, to a navigable depth of 25 feet, including a guard lock, is not now necessary or advisable in the interests of navigation.

Should we in the face of such a warning as that and in view of the obvious fact that this is the mere beginning of what is bound to be an expensive improvement, undertake this very considerable expenditure and establish such a policy?

During the delivery of Mr. BURTON's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will suspend while the Senate receives a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 10304) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Iron Wood Bluff, Itawamba County, Miss.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GILLET, Mr. GRAFF, and Mr. LIVINGSTON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 31856. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 32010. An act to create a tariff board.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 10053. An act to extend the time within which the Baltimore & Washington Transit Co. of Maryland shall be required to put in operation its railway in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 8, 1896, as amended by an act of Congress approved May 29, 1908; and

S. 10099. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

TARIFF BOARD.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. For just a moment. I wish to suggest, so as to call the matter to the attention of the Senate, that the House bill just sent to us establishing a tariff board shall continue, for the present, to lie on the President's table, subject to a motion for immediate consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I demand the regular order, which is the speech of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Who has yielded to me.

Mr. BAILEY. I demand the regular order, and against that demand the Senator from Ohio can not yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I submit the question to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Indiana, but not for the purpose of interfering with the business of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. I insist on the point of order that a Senator having the floor can only yield it with the consent of the Senate, and I insist upon the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If it should go to the committee—

Mr. BAILEY. It will go to the committee notwithstanding the request of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have no objection, if the Senate shall so order.

Mr. BAILEY. We will see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor and will proceed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28632) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

After the conclusion of Mr. BURTON's speech,

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it is not necessary to reply to the Senator from Ohio, for this is the same item to which he objected in the last Congress, and these are the same arguments which then failed to convince the Senate. There is this difference, however, that he then had adverse reports from the local engineer to the final reviewing board of engineers, which he employed with more effect before the conference committee than before the Senate.

Over my protest the Senate finally yielded to the amendment of the House striking out the provision that had been inserted by the Senate and substituting the provision to which the Senator from Ohio has referred. Under that provision and in pursuance of it the five engineers examined this project on the ground, and not only reported in favor of its feasibility, but also reported in favor of its desirability, and that ought to have ended the matter.

I maintain that under that provision of the last rivers and harbors act the board of review had no jurisdiction over this question. It is absurd to suppose that we appointed a special board to review a project which the General Board of Engineers had condemned and then authorized that General Board of Engineers to review the report of the special board of engineers. It would be a gross absurdity to create one board to review the report of another and then allow the other board to review and overrule the opinion of the board created to review its own report. The Congress of the United States has doubtless done some absurd things. I might even, if I were in a bad temper, say that it has done many absurd things, but I gravely doubt if it has ever intended to do anything so absurd as that.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio now seeks to impress the Senate with the idea that I am here advocating this measure as a means of regulating freight rates in the State of Texas. The Senator from Ohio has never heard me make any such argument on the floor of the Senate, or in committee room, or in private conversation—

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield to an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. The practically unanimous report from all the engineers who have passed upon the project is to the effect that the regulation of freight rates would be the only ground on which an argument could be based for this improvement.

Mr. BAILEY. In other words, Mr. President, it is the argument of the engineers which the Senator from Ohio attempts to answer instead of the argument of "the Senator from Texas."

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Texas—

Mr. BAILEY. So long as I have the honor to represent that State upon this floor, I assume the responsibility of speaking for her in part, and I do not consider that the Senator from Ohio can answer the arguments, however poor they may be, which I submit to the Senate by replying to what has been said by the engineers.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a further interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. BURTON. In the very voluminous arguments made on behalf of this improvement, filed with the report, that same claim is made of the influence upon freight rates, and it assumes an importance greater than any other.

Mr. BAILEY. I have not made that argument, Mr. President, and I am not inclined to believe that the harbor improvements of this country are intended to influence freight rates; but, on the contrary, I have supposed all these years that they are intended to create commercial facilities which will enable our people to transact promptly and safely their business with the balance of the world. I understand, of course, that the argument in favor of certain river improvements is generally

based upon the effect which they exert over freight rates, but I had not heretofore supposed that this is true in the case of harbor improvements.

In the old days of the Republic, when great men gravely doubted the right and power of Congress to improve the rivers of the country, no man ever doubted the power of Congress to construct or improve our harbors. If I am not mistaken, Gen. Jackson, when President, once forced the Congress, either by an actual veto or by a threatened veto, to separate the river bill from the harbor bill, and he cheerfully approved the bill providing for the improvement of our harbors.

Whether the creation of this commercial facility will affect freight rates or not is, to my mind, not the important question here. The question here, and the only question here, is whether or not it is a facility demanded by the convenience of the people who seek the sea through the Gulf of Mexico. The engineers have not questioned the feasibility of this work, and they have based their adverse report solely upon the proposition that the commerce of that particular locality does not warrant the expenditure, which, permit me to say just here, is not nearly so large as the Senator from Ohio has indicated to the Senate, because, in his statement that it will cost more than \$2,000,000 he has included an expenditure on work which must be provided for whether this amendment remains in the bill or not. He has included expenditures on the work of the jetties, which, if this were torn from the bill and abandoned forever, must still be done, and which I take it, the Senator from Ohio desires to be done, because I did not fail to note his solicitude for another port in Texas as against Beaumont and Orange. As between Port Arthur and Beaumont, as between Sabine and Orange, I think the Senators from Texas may safely be left to choose. We represent all of them, and if we make a mistake in doing for one what ought to have been done for the other we are amenable to their power, but if the Senator from Ohio makes a mistake in that respect he is beyond their punishment.

I have never believed that Senators from other States should attempt to control matters of this kind within a State which they do not represent; and I do not base that opinion on what we commonly call the courtesy of the Senate. I believe that what is so often flippantly referred to as the courtesy of the Senate has an infinitely more substantial basis than a mere desire to be polite to our associates. It is based upon the fact—the important fact—that if a Senator from Ohio interferes in a matter local to Texas and decides that matter wrong, he is beyond the jurisdiction of the people of Texas, and it might happen that the more they disliked him the better his own constituents would be pleased with him. I do not say that such is the case as between Texas and Ohio, and I am glad to say that it is not; but we can recall a time in this country, still within the memory of living men, when Senators from certain States would ask no better testimonial of their fitness than the condemnation of the people of certain other States. Let us hope that such a time will never come again, but we must not forget that it existed within the memory of even the youngest Senator on this floor. On the other hand, if the Senator from Ohio abstains from all interference with matters local to Texas, and the Texas Senators decide them wrong, the people of that State have their recourse. It is in obedience to the great principle which holds the representative responsible to his constituents, and not merely as a matter of politeness, that the Senate, time out of mind, has permitted the Senators from every State to decide all questions local to the States which they represent. Therefore, if I delay the appropriations for Port Arthur and Sabine, to which the Senator from Ohio would consent, and I choose to struggle for the appropriations which I believe to be right and proper at Beaumont and Orange, he can well leave that for me to settle with my constituents.

The Senator from Ohio, I regret to say, has reechoed the insinuation against the wisdom and the fairness of our State railroad commission which is to be found in the Engineer's report of last year. I then resented that objectionable passage and characterized it as an impudent intrusion of their views upon a question not committed to them; but I would not use such harsh words to describe the reference which the Senator from Ohio has made, because, charged as he is with the duty of legislating on the subject, he doubtless feels that it is both his right and duty to discuss it even to the point of criticizing the tribunals of a State. In that view, however, he gravely errs, for as the railroad commission of Texas can control matters affecting only our own people, it does not lie in the mouth of men from other States to complain at its conduct so long as we are satisfied. Texas was the first State in this Union to create an efficient railroad commission and to clothe it with the ample power which it now possesses. Other States had created commissions of a kind before ours, but ours

was the first efficient one in the history of the American Republic. Although it was stubbornly resisted when the proposition was submitted to our people, it is now accepted as such a just and such a wise law that I doubt if a proposition to repeal it would receive the votes of 5 per cent of our people. Even the railroads themselves confess that it has remedied many of the abuses for which they claimed conditions more than themselves had been responsible; and, notwithstanding the angry controversy that raged about it for months and even for years, it has so vindicated the wisdom of its policy to the people of our State that we hear no criticism of it now. Not only are our people thoroughly satisfied with the law which created and controls their railroad commission, but, sir, they repose absolute confidence in the commissioners who execute that law; and I think it comes with bad grace from a Senator representing another State to stand on the floor of the Senate and find fault with its orders and decisions.

But, Mr. President, while I think the reference of the Senator from Ohio was an obvious impropriety, it was not so bad as the first report of the Board of Engineers, for when an arm of the executive department of this Government, in tendering its advice to Congress, proceeds to the extent of criticizing the operations of a State, they transcend all the rules of orderly procedure.

I probably ought not to say that the Board of Engineers is now an arm of the executive department. They have become not only the arm, but the body, brain, and soul of the legislative department with respect to these river and harbor appropriations; they drew this bill, and a Senator representing the greatest Commonwealth in this Union can not obtain a paltry appropriation for his State, no matter how small or how crying the need for it may be, unless he can secure the indorsement of the Army engineers. Think of it, Mr. President, that Senators and Representatives, speaking for their people, and commissioned to speak for them, must stand on the outside of a committee room, with their hats in their hands, while an Army engineer tells the committee what ought to be and what ought not to be allowed to the great States of this Union.

I see before me two distinguished Senators who have the good fortune to be members of the Committee on Commerce, and I know that they struggled, as I did, for an appropriation which no man in this Senate who knows either of them will deny they believed was proper, because they would not have asked for what they did not consider proper, and yet they struggled in vain there with their associates on the committee, the decree of the Army engineers overruling their appeal and outweighing the respect and confidence which every member of that committee reposes in their judgment and in their patriotism. All that yielded to the mere decree of a board of Army engineers.

I want, in passing, to warn Senators who are inclined to support a tariff commission bill to be admonished by their experience with this Board of Army Engineers. We began consulting them, first a little and then a little more and then a little more, until to-day I assert here on the floor of the Senate that not a Member of this body can obtain an appropriation of \$30,000 without the approval—of the committee? No. Of the Senate? No; but of a Board of Army Engineers, who, while undoubtedly well qualified to solve the engineering problems, are apt to know little about the commercial necessities of a State; and yet those men decide absolutely for both branches of Congress what appropriations shall be made for these States. We simply register their decrees; we simply record their will. It is true that we do not always get what they are willing for us to have, but it is likewise true that we never get what they are not willing for us to have. So it will be when a tariff commission is created. A board of experts, expending a half million dollars a year, traversing all lands, bringing back their particular and special information to the secrecy of their own board rooms, and then retailing it to the American Congress at its convenience, will ultimately, sir, control our tariff legislation. When you create such a board you abdicate your power to levy taxes, just as you have now abdicated your power to make river and harbor improvement appropriations. In the nature of things and according to the construction of the human mind, a board of experts will control a Congress of nonexperts. Perhaps there are some Members of the Congress who have not sufficient information to make a tariff bill, and I think it would be well if the people superseded them with other men who are equipped to do so; but, Mr. President, when we give up our own power to levy taxes upon the people of the United States, let us restore to the people the power to elect those who are really to regulate their taxes.

The Senator from Ohio has not answered the argument with which I have sought to justify the construction of an inland

harbor, not 36 miles from the deep water, as he suggests, but an inland harbor. Everybody familiar with the history of the Gulf of Mexico understands the danger in which every place along its coast perpetually stands. I doubt if there is another stream in all of this wide world whose coast is ravaged by storms of such destructive fury. Those storms are not merely along the coast of Texas; they are along the whole line of the Gulf. While I do not speak with absolute information on that point, I have been told that in one of the principal harbors of Mexico, when the storm rages the fiercest, great ships are compelled to stand out to the sea in order to keep from being dashed to pieces against the wharves. But whether that is true or not, I do not need to cite instance after instance to the Senate to teach it how furious those storms are on the Mexican Gulf.

I am persuaded myself, Mr. President, that the best and safest place upon which to establish these Gulf ports is as far to the inland as can conveniently be arranged. I would not discourage those who have the courage and the hardihood to live at the water's edge and brave the fury of the storm. I honor their perseverance and their attachment to their homes, and I shall rejoice to see their towns and cities grow and prosper. But, to say the least of it, it is a wise policy to make one or two experiments of an inland harbor, and thus demonstrate where the best safety lies. If those Gulf coast cities can all be saved from the ravages of the storm, then, of course, the very shore line is the best place for a port; but if we read the history of the last 50 years I think there will be few of us who will not recognize the wisdom, not to say the necessity, of experimenting with inland harbors. The expenditure is not great, and the people of the two counties particularly and locally interested are taxing themselves dollar for dollar of the amount they ask this great Government to spend.

The Senator from Ohio adverted in no complimentary way to the Houston ship channel or canal, and he would leave the Senate to infer that in his opinion that great work is a failure. As much as I respect his opinions on these questions, Mr. President, it is difficult to be entirely patient with him when he talks in such a strain. Against his theory and at this distance I oppose the opinions of hard-headed, practical, and successful business men who are on the ground. Very recently they held an election in Harris County to decide whether or not those people would contribute \$1,200,000 of their hard-earned money toward the enterprise which he stigmatizes with a sneer, and that intelligent, enterprising, and prosperous people voted by something over 7,000 as against something less than 600 to tax themselves and their posterity by the sale of bonds to contribute one-half of the money which this project requires.

Mr. President, Texas is practically the only State in this Union whose people have been compelled to tax themselves in order to defray the expenses of these public works; but we have done so cheerfully in more than one instance, and we are ready to do so now. The Senate might not believe with its knowledge of that situation that it is wise to spend a million and almost two hundred thousand dollars upon this work, but when Senators occupied with a thousand things, and unable to investigate this one, take the time to remember that the people who live there, and whose wealth is infinitesimal when compared with the wealth of this great country, are willing to tax themselves \$600,000 to pay one-half of these expenses, I think it is as little as we could do to accept their willingness to put their own money in the enterprise as sufficiently establishing the value and the necessity of it. Mr. President, in concluding, I will say to Senators from other States that Texas is merely the way by which they reach the markets of the world; and if they deny us sufficient harbor facilities, the injury extends far beyond our border, and that great western region, which has become the granary of the world, suffers as much as we do. It is not alone for us that I demand this additional facility, but it is in behalf of those who are welcome to our hospitable borders and who have created the necessity for new harbors by their generous use of our old ones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill on page 31, line 10.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 31, after line 19, to insert:

Improving mouth of Brazos River, Tex.: Continuing improvement and maintenance, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 32, to insert:

Improving Brazos River, Tex., from Old Washington to Waco: For the completion of lock and dam at Hidalgo Falls, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "dollars" to insert "for the construction of lock and dam at or about Pine Bluff, \$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Improving Trinity River, Tex.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance by open-channel work, \$40,000; for the construction of lock and dam at or about Pine Bluff, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 9, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause a reexamination to be made of the Jefferson-Shreveport waterway, Texas and Louisiana, with a view to such modification as may be necessary or desirable in the project for its improvement by the construction of a dam at the foot of Caddo Lake, and to suspend work on said project until further action by Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 2, to insert:

Improving Ouachita River, Ark. and La.: Continuing improvement by removing snags, leaning trees, and other obstructions between Camden and Arkadelphia, in the State of Arkansas, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE AND PROMOTION OF COMMERCE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6708) to amend the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer the following for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire offers the following, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That on Thursday, February 2, commencing at the hour of 2 o'clock, the Senate will vote upon all amendments pending or to be offered to the bill (S. 6708) to amend the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce," and upon the bill itself, before adjournment on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, that the request of the House for a conference be granted, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. BURKETT, and Mr. FOSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28632) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed on page 33, line 7.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 36, after line 7, to insert:

Improving harbor at Arcadia, Mich.: For dredging and maintenance, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 16, before the word "harbor," to insert "inner and outer," so as to make the clause read:

Improving inner and outer harbor at Holland, Mich.: For maintenance, \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 21, to insert: Improving Zippel Bay, Lake of the Woods, Minn.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1276, Sixty-first Congress, third session, \$27,781.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 2, to insert:

Improving Illinois and Mississippi Canal by raising Aqueduct 1, Lock 4, one highway bridge and approaches and the banks of the canal where the canal crosses East Bureau Creek, just below the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway bridge across the same stream, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 2, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit such changes of harbor lines and diversion of the channel of the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn., as may be necessary to provide for the improvement of navigation, for suitable levees, transportation terminals, and landing places for shipping in said city.

Such changes and diversion shall be shown by plans and plats thereof, which shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers before any work shall be done thereon, and any change therefrom shall be unlawful unless a plan and plat thereof shall have been previously filed with and approved by the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers, and there shall be submitted to Congress a survey and estimate of the amount, character, and cost of any work proper to be done by the United States in connection therewith, but neither this act nor any action taken thereunder by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War shall be construed as in any way committing the United States to any expense or obligation without direction by Congress.

As a condition thereof it shall be agreed by the said city of St. Paul as a part of said proposed plan that the said levees and landing places for shipping shall remain under the ownership or control of the said municipality unless otherwise authorized by Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 5, to insert:

Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River: Completing construction of canal between Lake Winnibigoshish and Leech Lake, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 8, to insert:

Improving Missouri River, with a view to securing a permanent 6-foot channel between Kansas City and the mouth of the river: The Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute the improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$600,000, exclusive of the amounts heretofore appropriated.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am not sure that I shall vote against this amendment, but it seems to me desirable to present at this time some considerations pertaining partly to this specific matter and partly to the general subject of the development of inland navigation.

First, however, I wish to express my emphatic dissent from the view expressed by the Senator from Texas in regard to legislation for river and harbor improvements. His argument is that those questions belong exclusively to the State in which they are located. They do not, Mr. President. In the first place, there is not a harbor in the State of Texas which does not have railway lines radiating out for hundreds and even thousands of miles into other States. So it is a question not of any county seat or of any particular city, but of the whole area tributary to a port, and it is for Congress to decide what is the best port to select in Texas, Louisiana, or any other State, for the reason especially, Mr. President, that these improvements are not local. They are national. If they are local, let the States in question take care of them themselves, but if they come here to Congress and ask for appropriations it can only be on the ground that the expenditure of money for the development of the port or river is a matter of national concern. I dissent most decidedly from the idea that no Senator from another State has a right to criticize a proposed expenditure that may prove futile or develop into a blunder. If they are going to claim the right to determine themselves where harbors are to be improved, then let the localities do the work and provide the money.

I can not forbear to mention some considerations of public policy in this connection. No one is more thoroughly aware than I am of the criticism, the obloquy, that is visited upon any Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate when he opposes a projected river and harbor improvement in the respective States of the Union. The people in these localities are always unanimous for the expenditure of money in their neighborhood. Even if it meant the mere digging of holes in the ground, if it meant the construction of useless masonry, they are confident that money would be placed in circulation among them, and therefore there would be a unanimous voice—perhaps a very loud outcry—for appropriations. But it is for Congress, with all its Members, to scrutinize the claims of the different localities and determine whether they are wise and whether they will bear the test of national standards. So long as I continue a Member of the Senate, whether it be in the face of adverse votes or not, whether it incurs criticism or not,

I shall stand for the idea that it is the right of any Member on this floor to express his opinions in regard to any propositions which may be presented.

I desire to say, Mr. President, that in the development of our river and harbor policy, if I can see aright, the individual Member will count less, the whole body will count more, and the whole body will be more and more insistent for the advice and judgment of the Board of Engineers. If you leave this to individual claims, to the clamorous demands of communities, it means a carnival of loot and extravagance and the perpetration of monumental blunders.

I do not sympathize with the view that the Board of Engineers should limit their opinions to mere matters of engineering. Mr. President, if you look over the river and harbor acts of previous years you will find many items that were inserted injudiciously. You will find items carried to-day for improvements which never ought to have been inaugurated, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that whatever blunders were committed were initiated just about in proportion as the judgment of the engineers was disregarded. They have made blunders and mistakes, usually on the side of liberality rather than on the side of rejecting improvements, and their training gives them a facility and a right to speak upon the commercial phases of these questions.

Then again, as I stated once before on this floor, it is impossible to sever the connection between that which pertains to engineering and that which pertains to commercial development. There may be an improvement which if it cost only \$100,000 would be profitable and would show an adequate return in the development of commerce, but if that same improvement cost a million dollars it would not be judicious to undertake it. So how under any well-defined system can you separate the two?

Mr. President, I trust we shall not yield to arguments of this nature, that it is the locality that must decide. I feel assured that if we should do so the plan of determining this whole matter would shortly have to be left to commissions or probably to executive departments of the Government, because in a very few years the mistakes made under even the best system of legislation would be so glaring that an absolute change of policy would be necessary.

We are not in error when adhering to the rule that improvements should not be commenced without the recommendation of the Board of Engineers. There is no country in the world that has a system of river and harbor improvements which does not depend upon its technical department to point out that which is desirable. The best means of communication between different localities, the depth, the probable commercial development upon rivers and canals, is all referred to an expert department in the Republic of France; the same is true in Germany and everywhere else where a wise policy is adopted.

As regards the proposed improvement here, Mr. President, I think the first thing we ought to decide is just what we are committing ourselves to do in this expenditure of \$600,000, coupled with an appropriation of a million dollars in a preceding bill. Without referring to any executive document or report, we are making these two appropriations, respectively, of \$1,000,000 and of \$600,000.

When the last bill was passed there was a report relating to the Missouri River, of the Sixtieth Congress, second session, designated as Document No. 1120. The survey was made in pursuance of a provision in the river and harbor act of March 2, 1907, in these words:

Missouri River from its mouth to Kansas City, and from Kansas City to Sioux City: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, cause to be made only such further general instrumental survey as may be deemed necessary.

The last clause of this provision is not important, except that it makes it discretionary to adopt measurements and surveys already made. This report is very voluminous. It reviews the commerce of the river for preceding years; it gives in detail the engineering conditions, the benefits to adjacent property, and so forth. In transmitting it Gen. Marshall, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, says, and I have to read from this at some length—

In his survey report of April 30, 1908, Capt. Schulz—

That is the local engineer—

gives a very comprehensive statement of the original condition of the Missouri River and the efforts hitherto put forth for its improvement, together with his views and recommendations for its further treatment. A careful résumé of his report is given in the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated June 8, 1908, also herewith.

The actual navigable depth in the Missouri River below Sioux City is 3 feet at low water and 9 feet at high water. It appears from Capt. Schulz's report that by the means of snagging and the use of works of regulation and revetment a depth of 6 feet at low water can readily

be obtained, and by a more extensive use of the same means a depth of 10 and even 12 feet at that stage may be secured. The estimates submitted by him are as follows: For 6-foot depth (completion in three years), Sioux City to Kansas City, \$3,900,000.

It is not necessary for me to read the whole of it:

From Kansas City to the mouth, \$3,500,000.

The last figure is all that is pertinent in this discussion. The estimate submitted by him is as follows:

For a 6-foot depth (completion in three years):	
Kansas City to the mouth	\$3,500,000
For 12-foot depth (completion in five years):	
Sioux City to Kansas City	22,500,000
Kansas City to the mouth	20,000,000

So it appears that there were two plans for the improvement of this section of the Missouri River, one for 6 feet and one for 12 feet, the former costing \$3,500,000 and requiring in the estimate of the engineer three years, and the other for 12 feet, costing \$20,000,000, completion in five years.

In the opinion of Capt. Schulz, based upon the existing and immediately prospective commerce, no greater expenditure than that required for a 6-foot depth seems warranted at the present time.

The views and estimates of the district officer are approved by the division engineer, Col. William H. Bixby, Corps of Engineers, who considers as eminently desirable and justifiable the improvement of the Missouri River not only to the 6-foot stage, but especially to the 12-foot stage, all the way to Sioux City.

The rest of the report leaves this question to Congress as a matter of policy.

In the act of last year a provision was inserted appropriating \$1,000,000 with a view to securing—I believe the word “permanent” is there—a permanent 6-foot stage. I have not the act immediately at hand.

Mr. President, that left the action of Congress uncertain as to what was meant, whether it was the 6-foot channel, costing \$3,500,000, or the 12-foot channel, costing \$20,000,000. This question is a very important one. It is true the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in reviewing the report, expressed a decided preference for the 12-foot stage, or rather for the permanent work, costing \$20,000,000. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the words “6-foot navigation” are employed, the presumption is that the lesser project, costing \$3,500,000, was meant.

In the discussion of the bill of last year I called attention to this uncertainty, and I wish to refer briefly to the debate on this subject. On the 19th of April, 1910, the rivers and harbors bill was under discussion and a question was asked by myself:

What do I understand the Senator from Missouri to advocate—this \$20,000,000 improvement or the \$3,000,000 improvement?

The general figures were given, \$3,000,000 instead of \$3,500,000.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Missouri advocates the three and one-half million dollar improvement, believing, with the engineers and practical rivermen, that that will give a permanent 6-foot channel the year round, and that that will be part of a permanent improvement which can be given a greater depth if necessary.

Mr. BURTON. That is the limit of the Senator's demands until it has been shown what can be done?

Mr. WARNER. That is the limit. The bill provides, as I remember, for a 6-foot channel.

Mr. STONE. On the contrary, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the senior Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. On the contrary, the bill provides for the \$20,000,000 improvement.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I differ from the senior Senator from Missouri on that, and I will tell why in a few moments; but I think it is very desirable that the Senate should know just what is expected in connection with that improvement.

The balance of the dialogue I can give more clearly without following the text. However, before doing that I will refer to another conversation in which the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] took part. It is found on page 5029 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 18, 1910. In speaking of the proposed improvement he said:

The engineers of the Army have reported more than once that this improvement is the proper one to be made and that the river is one of the easiest rivers to be improved and controlled in the country. The last report is to this effect. The local engineer, Maj. Schulz, states that in his opinion upon the expenditure of \$3,000,000 a channel of 6 feet can be provided.

This will be necessarily somewhat temporary in its character. The project itself is for a 6-foot channel from Kansas City to the mouth. The expenditure of \$3,000,000, in the opinion of Maj. Schulz, the local engineer, would serve an immediate purpose of establishing that channel for a while.

The district engineer, Col. Bixby, did not concur in that view.

Then he goes on to state that he seemed to favor the \$20,000,000 improvement if the improvement was attempted. He further says:

The bill as it came over from the House did not, for some reason, contain the usual statement that this improvement is to be prosecuted according to a given report of the engineers, but the only report made is the one to which I have alluded, which was made a year ago, upon which the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate proceeded, providing for a 6-foot channel. If it can be done for \$3,000,000, or \$5,000,000, or \$20,000,000, the less the better, let it be done.

Then he closes by saying:

I will say to the Senator from Ohio, speaking for myself as one Senator on this floor—not particularly speaking for my own immediate constituency, but to this provision of the bill, and from my knowledge of the situation there—I am in favor of the construction of a channel of 6 feet from Kansas City to the mouth of the river, whether it costs \$3,000,000 or ultimately \$20,000,000, as the district engineer, the Board of Engineers, and the Chief of Engineers think it will.

Mr. President, it thus appears, both from the report of the Chief of Engineers in this document, which Congress had before it, and from the discussion on the floor of the Senate, that a measure of uncertainty pertains to this provision.

There is a cogent reason why it would appear that the larger project was not adopted. It has been the invariable custom in rivers and harbors bills, when a new improvement or a new method of prosecuting a work was desired, to refer to the executive document by number and to the Congress in which the report on which that improvement is based was made. An improvement was under way in the Missouri River. It is true it had been practically abandoned in 1902 and the river passed by so far as appropriations were concerned, but the work was resumed later, especially by the act of 1909. If, however, we follow what I think I may say is the invariable custom of Congress, whatever appropriation was made would be made for improvements then under way, and would refer to what had been done under previous projects rather than to this executive document. It is true the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors makes a reference to this in his report, which seems to show that in his opinion the later or larger improvement was adopted, but what he said in his report is not the question. The question is, How did he designate this improvement in the bill itself? Even if he did designate it in the report, the question would still be uncertain.

The important question about this \$600,000 is, What are we doing? Upon what do we intend to expend this money? What is the limit of the improvement? Are we by this provision committing ourselves to an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for the Missouri River below Kansas City, and practically committing ourselves, as well, to an expenditure of \$22,500,000 for the section between Kansas City and Sioux City, with an annual maintenance expense of \$500,000 between Kansas City and the mouth, and \$562,500 above Kansas City? I might add to that the annual expense of snagging, which is \$110,000, making the enormous figure—enormous for maintenance—of \$1,172,500.

Mr. President, having spoken on this point and called the attention of the Senate to the importance of understanding what is intended here, I wish to submit a few remarks in regard to the improvement of the interior rivers of this country. I have labored with this question for many years. The usual result of providing for the improvement of rivers has been a disappointment. It is useless to grope around to seek the causes; they are perfectly manifest, and I take the liberty to repeat in substance some observations on this subject already made. The crux of the whole question is the establishment of harmonious relations between the transportation agencies of the country—the rivers and the railroads.

It is impossible to frame judicious plans for the improvement of rivers and inland waterways in the United States without a careful review of the whole subject of transportation. No adequate development of the waterways of the United States can be secured without a readjustment of the relations between waterways and railways. Both should be considered as agencies for the carrying of traffic. In many instances the economical transfer of freight from one portion of the country to the other involves the use of both railways and waterways, and without cooperation between them the most helpful results can not be secured. As long as unrestricted competition exists under present conditions the railways will continue to carry a large amount of traffic that should more properly go by water.

There are certain advantages belonging to the railways which are permanent and inevitable. They have a wider area of distribution; they can be constructed in any direction; they are more readily adaptable to the newly arising and ever-shifting demands of producing areas and of markets. In the handling of freight they have great advantages, because in providing for the receipt and delivery of freight at factories or warehouses, branch lines or switches can be constructed. Railroads can reach all towns and cities alike, whether located on the water or not, while obviously boats or barges can not be used except for the receipt and delivery of freight or passengers from or to localities upon waterways. Railroads have a further advantage in the increasing importance of terminals and facilities necessary for the prompt and economical loading and unloading of freight.

The cost of hauling freight, as compared with the handling or delivery at terminal points, has experienced a great change

in the last 40 years. The cost of hauling has very materially decreased, while the cost of handling and the expenses connected with terminal facilities, though diminished in many ways, have not decreased accordingly. There is also a readier transfer of traffic from one railroad to another, as compared with the transfer from water to land or land to water. The variation in the level of rivers increases the difficulty of providing an adequate equipment for handling freight on the banks of most of our rivers. The freight carried by rail is more perfectly protected from storm and from the elements, and the railway insures goods carried in its cars or handled at its terminals against loss.

These points, Mr. President, in my judgment, contain the vital reasons for the decadence of water-borne traffic on our inland waters.

The waterways must always be confronted with these disadvantages. There are others, however, which can be prevented or regulated by law, such as the right to charge lower rates between points where railway lines are in competition with water routes. The railways are not prohibited from acquiring boat lines in competition with them, or from making traffic arrangements with them, but ordinarily they refuse to prorate on through routes. Frequent reference has been made to the development of waterways in Europe, and sometimes without any adequate comprehension of different conditions existing there. These arise from greater density of population, the earlier development and greater advantage of waterway systems, the existence of a class of boatmen engaged in waterway traffic, who are willing to work with comparatively small gains, and either State ownership of the railways and their management in cooperation with waterways, or complete control and regulation as in France, where the railways are compelled to charge 20 per cent more than the waterways for carrying the same variety of freight. It should not be overlooked that the railway mileage per square mile in the settled portions of the United States is greater than in Europe, and the mileage per 1,000 of population is five times as great in the United States as in Europe, showing that our country is much more adequately furnished with the means for railway transportation.

Notwithstanding the great advantages belonging to railways in the transportation field, the superior qualities of waterways

and the greater freedom of competition which pertains to water transportation can not be disregarded. Under the present relations between the two means of carrying freight, however, most of our inland waterways can not be utilized to a high degree of efficiency.

Mr. President, in a few words I have thus sought to set forth my position in regard to the development of rivers. I fear that much of the work thus far done and many of the appropriations thus far made will not only result unsatisfactorily, but in waste and in loss. If there is any place in the whole United States where an attempt to develop waterway transportation has in it nothing but discouragement, it is on this stretch of the Missouri River from the mouth to Kansas City.

In the olden days, in 1858, the trains of the so-called Pacific Railway used to run from St. Louis to Jefferson City, and from there the passengers were carried by boat to Kansas City. The river was an important artery of commerce. All that, however, is changed. In the last year let us see what the returns were after a grand total of expenditures made for the whole river—and it is difficult to separate this stretch—a grand total of \$12,019,022.01.

The commerce on the Missouri River from the mouth to Sioux City, a distance of about 800 miles, was as follows:

Long-trade packets. How much freight was carried? One hundred and thirty-three tons. To such a result have we come after the expenditure of over \$12,000,000! The average length of haul of this 133 tons was a trifle over 100 miles. This was all that had any semblance of through traffic.

Short-trade packets, miscellaneous boats, and so forth, 24,437 tons. This was carried an average of about 21 miles. With the consent of the Senate, I shall present the figures which are taken from the last report of the Chief of Engineers, and ask that they be printed together with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio has permission to print the matter referred to by him.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following table, giving the amount of freight carried, towed, and rafted, but not including any ferriage, is an approximation to the lower Missouri River trade for 1909:

Commerce of the Missouri River from mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, during the calendar year 1909.

Class.	Grain and hay.	Live stock.	Lumber, wood, and ties.	Building material, sand, and coal.	General merchandise.	Total.	Mile-tons.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	
Long-trade packets.....	83		20		30	133	13,738
Short-trade packets, miscellaneous boats, etc.....	7,211	2,188	4,466	8,958	1,614	24,437	503,085
Sand steamers and barges.....				290,263		290,263	259,851
Rafts.....			6,700			6,700	168,782
Riprap, willows, and lumber used by private parties for bank protection.....				19,277		19,277	273,200
Total.....	7,294	2,188	11,186	318,498	1,644	340,810	1,218,696

Passengers carried, 2,371.

Mr. BURTON. The next item is larger in tonnage—sand steamers and barges, 290,263 tons. But let us see how far it is carried. The total ton-mileage was 259,251 miles, showing that this sand was hauled an average of less than 1 mile, and yet it is counted in the tonnage statistics. Rafts, 6,700 tons; riprap, willows, and lumber used by private parties for bank protection, 19,277 tons.

It does not need any argument to show that all of this traffic, except the long-trade packets carrying 133 tons and the short-trade packets carrying 24,437 tons, the former with an average of about 101 miles and the latter of about 21 miles, can be provided for without any elaborate improvement of that river.

Mr. President, these figures speak louder than any argument of mine in proclaiming the facts. Oh, but it is said, there can not be any navigation on the river because you do not improve it; spend \$20,000,000, and if you do not spend \$20,000,000 at least spend \$3,500,000. Unfortunately, Mr. President, we have tried that out in the years that have past and have found that the expenditure of these millions accomplishes no results, and that even before the Government entered upon its plan of improvement this river was utilized for the conveyance of traffic far more than now.

I do not object to the spending of a reasonable sum of money on this river—hundreds of thousands of dollars even—to see if you can develop navigation. I think it will prove a costly experiment, but an effort has been made at Kansas City to build boats to compete with the railways and within reasonable

limits they should be encouraged. It should be noted, however, that in the face of the statement made to us that a million dollars has been subscribed by the merchants of that city, and the further statement that the merchants have agreed to ship by that river, nothing has as yet been done, although there is a channel of sufficient depth and width for a large portion of the year to carry the traffic.

I think it is a pretty strong proposition to say that when a million dollars is proposed to be invested in boats, \$3,500,000 shall be appropriated by the Government to aid the channels for those boats. And what is the fact? They are confronted with an unnatural situation as to railroad freight rates. The rate on first-class freight from New York to St. Louis is 87½ cents per hundred; from New York to Kansas City it is \$1.47½ per hundred; that is, 87½ cents for more than 1,000 miles from New York to St. Louis, and 60 cents, or more than two-thirds as much, for the shorter haul of less than 400 miles from St. Louis to Kansas City. Do away with that discrimination or inequality and no matter if the river was studded with boats every one of them would be taken off. That is what has happened in the past, and just so sure as transportation conditions are as they now are, that is what will happen in the future.

I want to make reference briefly to some other river channels, where they have not only the 6 feet which is so anxiously sought here, but more. The best object lesson is the Mississippi River from St. Louis down to Cairo, a stretch of 206 miles. From Cairo to the Gulf there is an assured depth of 9 feet. From

St. Louis to Cairo there has been, for six or seven years past, an 8-foot channel; that is, they have between St. Louis and New Orleans, between the greatest city in the Mississippi Valley and an ocean port, a channel not less than 8 feet in depth.

First, let us notice what we have been expending on that stretch of river. The money appropriated for this stretch of 206 miles by Congress for the 20 years ending in 1907 exceeds the amount expended by the Central Government of Germany in the improvement of the Rhine from Strassburg to the frontier of Holland, a distance of 355 miles, but the amount of tonnage handled on this portion of the Mississippi River in 1908 was only 374,000 tons, while that on the Rhine in the same year was between thirty and forty million tons, an amount eighty to one hundred times as great.

Some people say that we have been niggardly in our appropriations for the improvement of rivers. Let us see whether we have been niggardly in this case or not. The amount expended is almost the same as on the Missouri River. In 1881 the estimated cost of obtaining a channel 8 feet in depth was \$16,397,500. Up to June 30, 1909, the amount expended in seeking to obtain this 8-foot channel was \$12,718,000, and then, after they had expended more than three-fourths of the estimated amount, a reexamination was asked to ascertain how much it would cost to be assured of that depth. The estimated cost of obtaining a permanent 8-foot channel from St. Louis to Cairo in 1909 was \$21,000,000; in other words, after \$12,000,000 had been spent for this purpose, it was estimated that it would cost nearly \$5,000,000 more than before a dollar was expended to secure the channel. That does not give much hope of assured or salutary results. In the meantime an 8-foot channel has been in existence and readily available, save for a few days in the year, for six or seven years past.

Now, let us look at the traffic statistics. Let us see what hope we have for the Missouri when we compare it with another stream, on which St. Louis, a great city, is located. For 206 miles below that city there is a channel 8 feet deep, where it meets a great highway of commerce—the Ohio—and then below that a 9-foot channel by the Mississippi to the Gulf. The amount of traffic in this stretch of the river before expensive improvements were commenced, as measured by shipments from St. Louis in 1880, was 1,038,000 tons. At that time the prevailing depth was only between 3½ and 4 feet; that is, when the prevailing depth was 4 feet or less there was a traffic of over 1,000,000 tons. In the year 1908, with a depth of 8 feet, the volume of shipments from St. Louis was only 72,740 tons, or about one-fourteenth of the former amount.

Mr. President, I submit that in the face of such figures as these we should realize our responsibility to the people and be more careful in the making of appropriations for inland waterways. We are not doing our duty unless we do. A great change has taken place in conditions. These rivers, even though improved, are no longer utilized as they once were.

Passing now from the Mississippi River, which is a main stream, I want to give a few statistics as to the Red River, a smaller tributary than the Missouri; but, Mr. President, a river on which the prospects of development are as hopeful as on the Missouri. Like the Missouri, it drains an empire. The Red River flows in one general direction, from northwest to southeast. The Missouri from its mouth extends 400 miles to Kansas City, and then, as it were, if you go further upstream, it turns at right angles; and on all that upper portion there are towns, reached by railways, which cross the river, carrying their products away to Chicago and to other cities. Again, the railway development in the locality of the Red River is by no means as great as it is in the neighborhood of the Missouri. The general range of charges for the carrying of traffic is very materially less in the valley of the Missouri. Still another point: From Kansas City to St. Louis there are numerous competing railways, while along the general course of the Red River there is an entire absence of the sharp competition that prevails between Kansas City and St. Louis.

Now, I want briefly to call the attention of the Senate to the amount of traffic on the Red River. Its improvement was commenced in the year 1828. We have expended altogether something like \$2,600,000 on this stream. At one time it was a great artery of commerce. Just at the close of the Civil War a large fleet of boats gathered at Shreveport, on this river. In earlier days there was a large amount of cotton, sugar, and other products of that region carried upon it. What was carried upon it, exclusive of saw logs, in the year 1908? Cotton, 6 tons; cotton seed, 300 tons; hides and skins, five one-hundredths of a ton—that would be 100 pounds—provisions, 6 tons; grain, 18 tons; miscellaneous, 511 tons. What a pitiable showing. There had been altogether an expenditure of \$2,600,000 on this

river, and yet less than a thousand tons were carried on it, aside from that which could float down or be carried down without this expensive improvement. This is another object lesson as to the probable result of the expensive improvement of the Missouri.

Mr. President, I am unwilling that this bill should pass without calling attention to the probable result of such an appropriation as this. We have, as was once said, "no lamp to guide our feet except that of experience," and experience in this particular has afforded a very unfavorable lesson.

The pending bill, be it said, does not provide to any such extent as did the prior bill for another class of extravagant improvements on rivers, namely, the construction of locks and dams, so that it is not necessary to dwell at length upon that subject.

I think we made one step forward when we inserted in the railroad bill a provision to the effect that when a railroad has lowered rates on lines in competition with water routes it can not raise them again except on proper showing made to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and requiring proof that the lower rates were not established to eliminate water competition. That was one of the recommendations of the National Waterways Commission.

I concede that freight rates are affected by the improvement of streams where traffic does develop, but what are we to do? Waste money by the hundreds of millions just to make our railways behave themselves? Have we not the courage, through the agencies that belong to the Government, when a railroad's charges are exorbitant, to compel it to lower its rates by appropriate legislation? I most emphatically dissent from the idea that we should engage in this kind of enterprise, in which confessedly we waste money in the hope—the realization, no doubt, in some cases—that railroad rates will be lowered. There is a readier and more intelligent and sensible way to do that than by this line of indirection.

There is one other phase of this proposed improvement. I quote from page 29 of the Report of the Chief of Engineers made in the Sixtieth Congress, second session:

Sheet 3 shows what great erosion is possible on these reaches, especially from Sioux City to Kansas City. Every change in velocity or direction of current means new erosion and subsequent partial deposit, causing untold loss in value of land and products. The existence of old lakes in the upper reach show conclusively where the river has meandered, and that in only recent years. The bottom land threatened or to be benefited on the upper reach, Sioux City to Kansas City, is 1,141.5 square miles, or 730,560 acres; and on the lower reach, Kansas City to the mouth, 788.8 square miles, or 504,832 acres. Total for the two reaches, 1,235,392 acres, which, at \$100 per acre, would be worth nearly \$125,000,000. To this amount should be added 24,000 acres of sand bar which would be reclaimed and filled in by improvement, and at \$50 per acre would be worth \$1,200,000.

Now, then, we should understand what will be the result of expenditures there. Are we making this improvement for navigation or for land reclamation?

What is to be the principal result—improved navigation or the protection or creation of private property? It is perfectly clear, it seems to me, to any mind which will give consideration to the facts that this is not going to develop any navigation.

The correct rule in the prosecution of this work would be for the Government to join with the localities and with the owners of the lands abutting in a fair division of the burden of expense. We have been doing too much of this work under the guise or semblance of improving navigation, where in reality the sole effect is the benefit of private property in the locality.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate longer, except to say that there is a rational way to manage this whole problem, and that is to begin with the idea that the control and utilization of the waters of the United States are just as important as the control and utilization of the land; that water as well as broad acres is an asset of the country.

Water may be utilized for navigation in certain instances, for irrigation in others, for furnishing a water supply in others; that under the influence of the tempest or the flood it is a destroying agent rather than a beneficent one. So far as we may we should control floods, prevent the erosion of banks, secure clarification as far as possible, all as a part of one great plan. Until we frame such a plan and take up this question in its entirety our treatment of the subject will necessarily be partial, and will bring no benefit commensurate with the cost; but when we unite all these uses, navigation can be developed where it is useful and desirable, irrigation can be fostered, water can be clarified, water power can be utilized, and in the combination of all these great objects unmeasured benefits will inure to the benefit of the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 43, after line 23, to insert:

Improving harbor at Humboldt Bay, Cal.: Continuing improvement, \$170,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$717,400, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 8, after the word "California," to strike out "Completing improvement of channel from the outer harbor to and including the turning basin, \$220,000; continuing improvement of the lateral channels into the east and west basins, \$50,000" and insert "Continuing improvement by dredging, \$270,000," so as to make the clause read:

Improving Los Angeles Harbor, Cal.: Continuing improvement by dredging, \$270,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 45, to insert:

Improving channel over Pinole Shoal, San Pablo Bay, Cal., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1103, Sixtieth Congress, second session, including the construction of a dredge for maintenance, \$400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$360,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 6, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "three," and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary for the construction of two suitable dredging plants, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$320,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated," so as to make the clause read:

Improving Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$350,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary for the construction of two suitable dredging plants, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$320,000 exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 19, to insert:

The provision of the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910, making appropriation for improving Siuslaw River, Oreg., is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Siuslaw River, Oreg.: Improving Siuslaw River, Oreg., at the mouth, in accordance with the project set forth in the report submitted in House Document No. 648, Sixty-first Congress, second session, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such material and work as may be necessary to complete said project and to maintain the same for one year during construction, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$165,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided further*, That before beginning said work or making said contract or contracts the Secretary of War shall be satisfied, by deposit or otherwise, that the port of Siuslaw or other agency shall provide for the accomplishment of said project the additional sum of \$215,500, which said sum shall be expended by the Secretary of War in the prosecution of said work and for its maintenance in the same manner and in equal amount as the sum herein appropriated and authorized to be appropriated from the Treasury of the United States: *And provided further*, That the port of Siuslaw may proceed with the construction of the south jetty in pursuance of the contract with Robert Wakefield, entered into December 24, 1909, to the full extent of said contract; and the amount to be furnished by the said port of Siuslaw, or other agency, as aforesaid, may be reduced by such amounts, not exceeding \$100,000, as may be expended under said contract, provided all the work so done shall be in accord with the project herein adopted and satisfactory to the Secretary of War."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 19, to insert:

Improving harbor at Bellingham, Wash.: Continuing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1161, Sixtieth Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions relative to cooperation on the part of local interests as set forth in said document, \$25,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$52,250, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 16, to insert:

Improving harbor at Olympia, Wash.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 9, 1908, and printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 5, Sixty-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions relative to cooperation on the part of local interests as set forth in said document, \$43,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 50, to insert:

Improving Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.: Continuing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 564, Sixty-first Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions relative to cooperation on the part of local interests, as set forth in said document, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$118,132, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 14, after the word "appropriated," to insert "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be authorized to have a resurvey made of Hilo Harbor with a view to determining whether a modification of the adopted project can be made which will increase the commercial facilities of the harbor without increasing the original limit of cost of the work," so as to make the clause read:

Improving harbor at Hilo, Hawaii: Continuing improvement, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$250,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be authorized to have a resurvey made of Hilo Harbor with a view to determining whether a modification of the adopted project can be made which will increase the commercial facilities of the harbor without increasing the original limit of cost of the work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 54, after line 8, to insert:

Rockland Harbor, Me., at and near Atlantic Point.
Kennebec River, channel west of Swan Island, Me.
Bluehill Inner Harbor, Me.
Winter Harbor, Me.
Carvers Harbor, Vinalhaven, Me.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 18, to insert:
Providence River and Harbor, R. I., with a view to deepening the channel to 30 feet.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 3, to insert:

New York Harbor, N. Y., with a view to securing a suitable depth of channel to the navy yard.
Gowanus Bay, N. Y., with a view to removing the shoal therein and making such other improvements as may be advisable, including a full consideration of the desirability and propriety of cooperation with local interests.

For a deep-water connection with suitable terminals that may be established at North Tonawanda at the head of the New York State Barge Canal.

Fort Pond Bay, Suffolk County, N. Y.
New York Harbor, N. Y., with a view to securing increased width and depth of water from a point at or near Southwest Spit, northwest of Sandy Hook, N. J., through Lower Bay, Raritan Bay, the channel between New Jersey and Staten Island, N. Y., to the channel in Upper Bay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 23, to insert:

Delaware River, at Morrisville, Pa.
Allegheny River, Pa., with a view to the construction of additional locks and dams.
Leipsic River, Del.
Appoquinimink River, Del.
Mispillion River, Del.
Murderkill River, Del.
Little River, Del.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 11, after the word "Virginia," to insert "and waters near, in, and about the city of Newport News," so as to make the clause read:

Harbor at Newport News, Va., and waters near, in, and about the city of Newport News, with a view to securing increased anchorage area for small craft.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 13, to insert:

Cape Charles City Harbor, Va., with a view to straightening the north side of channel at the entrance and increasing the width of the channel to 200 feet.
Western Branch of Elizabeth River, Va., with a view to deepening and widening the approach thereto.
Archies Hope River, Va., from Williamsburg to James River.
Potomac River at Colonial Beach, Va., with a view to a proper approach to the landing place.
Pamlico River, N. C., with a view to improving the inner channel on the north side of that river, and with a further view of removing any excavated material which may have heretofore been placed therein by the War Department, beginning at the mouth of Runyons Creek, on the north side of said river, below Washington, N. C., and extending eastwardly down said river as far as may be necessary.
Northeast Cape Fear River, N. C., from its mouth to Hallsville.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 11, to insert:
Swift Creek, N. C., with a view to dredging a channel through Horse Shoe Bend and Poplar Branch.
Basin of Winyah Bay, S. C., with a view to providing a uniform depth of 18 feet at mean low water and to giving increased harbor facilities to the city of Georgetown.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 17, to strike out—

Darien Harbor, Ga., with a view to securing the best channel to the sea—

And insert:

Darien Harbor and Doby Bar, Ga., with a view to securing the same depth on the bar as in the harbor, namely, 12 feet at mean low water.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 22, to insert:

Tugaloo River, Ga. and S. C., from its mouth to Fort Madison, S. C. Clearwater Harbor, Fla., from the mouth of the Anclote River to the beginning of the channel now being constructed by the Government from the south end of Clearwater Harbor into and through Boca Ciega Bay, thence into Tampa Bay.

St. Johns River, Fla., from deep water at or below Commodore Point to deep water above Sixmile Creek westward of the middle ground between Arlington Cut and the western shore of the river, including a full consideration of the desirability and propriety of cooperation on the part of riparian owners.

St. Marks River, Fla., from the town of St. Marks to the Gulf of Mexico.

Channel between the St. Johns River, Fla., and Cumberland Sound, by way of the Sisters Creek out of the St. Johns River, with a view to straightening and deepening the channel.

Harbor at St. Petersburg, Fla.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 3, to insert:

Bayou Lafourche, La., with a view to removing obstructions deposited by storms at its mouth and to restoring the depth at that point to 16 feet.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 7, to insert:

Mermentau River, La., with a view to the construction of a lock and dam to maintain the level of the inland waterway running through Grand Lake.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 16, to insert:

Guadeloupe River, Tex., to Victoria, with a view to improvement by locks and dams.

Colorado River, Tex., with a view to improvement by locks and dams. The mouth of the Brazos River to Velasco, Tex., and from Velasco to Waco.

Green River, Ky., at and near Lock and Dam No. 3, near Rochester, with a view to the diversion of the waters of Mud River from its present mouth above the said lock and dam to a suitable point below.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 2, to insert:

Survey and estimate of the cost of improving the Cuyahoga River, Ohio, from its mouth to a more southerly connection with the Ohio Canal, with a view to eliminating bends and securing a navigable depth of 21 feet, with suitable width; and the said survey and estimate shall include a report on any proposition for cooperation by localities affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 10, to insert:

White Lake Harbor, Mich., from the mouth of the channel to White Lake.

Pentwater Harbor, Mich., from the mouth of the channel to Pentwater Lake.

St. Joseph Harbor, Mich., with a view to its further improvement by the removal of a shoal and the securing of increased width and depth of channel below the Pere Marquette Railroad bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 22, after the word "improvement," to strike out "in order" and insert "and maintenance," so as to make the clause read:

Manitowoc Harbor and River, Wis., with a view to their further improvement and maintenance to meet the demands of commerce by the deepening of said river, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 2, to insert:

Lake of the Woods, at or near Arnesen, Minn., with a view to securing a harbor of refuge at that point.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 8, to insert:

Crescent City Harbor, Cal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 15, to insert:

Fremont Channel and McLeod Lake arms of Stockton Channel, San Joaquin River, Cal.

Mokelumne River, Cal., with a view to its improvement from the Galt-New Hope Bridge to a point at or near Woodbridge.

San Rafael Creek, Cal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 22, to insert:

Nehalem Bar and entrance to Nehalem Bay, Oreg., with view to improvement of same in cooperation with local interests.

Oregon Slough branch of Columbia River, Oreg., including a consideration of any proposition for cooperation by localities affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, after the word "Yaquina," to insert "with report upon any proposition for cooperation by local interests," so as to make the clause read:

Yaquina River, Oreg., from Toledo to Yaquina, with report upon any proposition for cooperation by local interests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 8, to insert:

San Juan Harbor, P. R.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 12, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 4. That so much of section 7 of the rivers and harbors act approved March 3, 1909, as provides that the term of the National Waterways Commission shall expire on March 4, 1911, be, and the same is hereby, repealed; and the said commission shall be continued until March 4, 1913. In addition to the duties prescribed in said section 7, said commission is hereby authorized and directed to investigate questions pertaining to waterways and correlated subjects, including the work upon the same by the different bureaus and departments of the Government. The provision in the said section 7 of the act of March 3, 1909, to the effect that the several departments and bureaus of the Government shall detail from time to time such officials and employees and furnish such information as may be requested by said commission in its investigations, is hereby reenacted and made applicable to the additional duties created by this section, and the said commission shall file a report upon the subjects herein set forth not later than January 1, 1913. Said commission is also authorized and directed to investigate and report upon the advisability and feasibility of proposed artificial waterways and upon proposed plans for the impounding of flood waters in rivers, by reservoirs or otherwise, including the following: First, the construction by the United States of the proposed canal from the Ohio River, at a point near Pittsburgh, to Lake Erie, the expense thereof being borne by local interests affected; second, the proposed canal from Lake Erie, by way of the Maumee River and Fort Wayne, or other direct and feasible route, to the southerly end of Lake Michigan; third, the proposed canal to connect the Anacostia River at some point near the District of Columbia boundary line with Chesapeake Bay, or some tributary thereof; also upon the practicability and desirability of constructing reservoirs and other hydraulic works necessary for the storage and utilization of water, to prevent floods and overflows, erosion of river banks and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of streams and enforce such flow during drought and low-water seasons in the drainage basin of the Ohio River and its tributaries; and the said commission in its report shall make recommendations as to the policy to be adopted in case such projects shall be deemed feasible. For the obtaining of the necessary engineering data the commission is authorized to call upon the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, and said corps shall furnish said data upon the request of the commission, and the expense of obtaining the same shall be paid from the appropriation contained in section 2 of this act.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to have some information in regard to this section. I notice in line 19 of the section it reads:

In addition to the duties prescribed in said section 7, said commission is hereby authorized and directed to investigate questions pertaining to waterways and correlated subjects, including the work upon the same by the different bureaus and departments of the Government.

Is it proposed to give this commission jurisdiction of the reclamation work of the West?

Mr. BURTON. I think I can answer the question. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can answer it more readily. Not except as connected with navigation, and by no means as far as turning over to them any control of reclamation work.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask another question? Would it not be possible to give the reclamation work over to this commission—that is, to permit the commission to assume jurisdiction of it if anyone desired to have it so?

Mr. BURTON. If anyone desired to have it so?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think it would be within the practical scope of their work to take charge of it.

Mr. BORAH. I understand, then, it is not the intention of the committee that such shall be done.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think so.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Idaho is correct. There is no purpose of that kind in the bill. It is simply a revival of an old commission which has been in existence for some time, and which has never attempted to interfere with reclamation work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 65, after line 11, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 5. That the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby increased by five colonels, six lieutenant colonels, 19 majors, 17 captains, and 13 first lieutenants. The increase in each grade hereby provided for shall be extended over a period of five years as nearly as practicable, and the original vacancies hereby created in each grade shall be filled by promotion from the next lower grade in accordance with existing law: *Provided*, That officers of the Corps of Engineers, when on duty under the Chief of Engineers, connected solely with the work of river and harbor improvements, may, while so employed, be paid their pay and commutation of quarters from the appropriations for the work or works upon which they are employed: *Provided further*, That whenever it shall be necessary, in order to properly prosecute works of river and harbor improvement, the Chief of Engineers is

authorized to detail for duty in charge of river and harbor districts or as members of boards of engineers any assistant engineers in the employ of the Engineer Bureau of the War Department. Vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers shall hereafter be filled, as far as may be consistent with the interests of the military service, by promotions from the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy: *Provided*, That vacancies remaining in any fiscal year after the assignment of cadets of the class graduating in that fiscal year may be filled from civil life as hereinafter provided: *And provided further*, That the proportion of any graduating class assigned to the Corps of Engineers shall not be less than the proportion which the total number of officers authorized at date of graduation for that corps bears to the total number of officers authorized at same date for all branches of the Army to which cadets are eligible for promotion upon graduation, except when such a proportionate number is more than the number of vacancies existing at date of graduation plus the number of retirements due to occur in the Corps of Engineers prior to the first day of the following January. To become eligible for examination and appointment, a civilian candidate for the appointment as second lieutenant must be an unmarried citizen of the United States between the ages of 21 and 29, who holds a diploma showing graduation in an engineering course from an approved technical school, and is eligible for appointment as a junior engineer under the Engineer Bureau of the War Department. Selection of eligible civilians for appointment, including term of probation, shall be made as the result of such competitive examination into the mental, moral, and physical qualifications, and under such rules and regulations as shall be recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what will be the effect of the amendment and what result will follow if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. FRYE. It will increase the corps of engineers who can be employed in river and harbor work about one-third, my recollection is. It has been recommended by the Secretary of War and by the President, and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs have reported favorably on a similar measure now pending before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Does it increase from to-day the number of officers in the Army?

Mr. FRYE. I do not think it increases the number of officers.

Mr. BORAH. Is not this the same provision, except that there are a less number of officers, that is covered by the bill coming from the House—House bill 7117?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is something like it, but it is not the same, and I think the proviso in the bill which is, perhaps, in the Senator's mind is not contained in this proposed amendment. That proviso, now omitted, read as follows:

Provided, That the President may, in his discretion, detail any Army engineer to the supervision or inspection of any engineering work or works of construction carried on by the Government pursuant to law.

That is not contained in this amendment to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. BORAH. There is no provision, then, in this amendment by which the Army engineers could be used for the purpose for which they were intended to be used, apparently, under the other bill?

Mr. WARREN. None at all. While that bill specifically stated that engineers could be used for various details, this proposed amendment leaves the law in that respect as it has stood for years and simply provides the necessary officers—expert men—to conduct the expenditure of the money carried in this bill and other river and harbor appropriation measures. The Army, as a fighting force, does not need engineers in any great numbers. Out of the present number of officers, 188, there are 162 engaged all the time or a portion of the time upon river and harbor and auxiliary works.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask, for information, if the provision contained on pages 66 and 67 with reference to the appointment of civilians upon examination who have graduated from some recognized engineering school is existing law.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment provides that—

To become eligible for examination and appointment, a civilian candidate for appointment as second lieutenant must be an unmarried citizen of the United States—

That is the law now regarding the matter—

between the ages of 21 and 29 who holds a diploma showing graduation in an engineering course from an approved technical school, and is eligible for appointment as a junior engineer.

Mr. HEYBURN. Can that class of persons be now appointed to the Engineer Corps under existing law?

Mr. WARREN. No; not directly to that particular corps.

Mr. HEYBURN. I thought it was a new provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are to be further amendments offered from the committee.

Mr. FRYE. I desire to offer one or two amendments.

On page 8, line 18, I move to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso:

Provided, That the project may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be so modified as to allow the widening of the channel of the river at bends wherever considered desirable.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 26, lines 9 and 11, I move to strike out the word "Mermenteau" and insert "Mermenton."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, after line 21, insert:

Improving South Haven Harbor, Mich.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary for the completion of this improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$198,000, exclusive of amounts heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 53, line 16, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty thousand dollars" and insert in lieu thereof "three hundred thousand dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 60, after line 2, I move to insert: Cimarron River, Okla., from its mouth to source of Kingfisher and Cottonwood Rivers.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 61, after line 8, I move to insert: Jordan River, Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 62, after line 8, I move to insert:

Spoon mouth of Yukon River, from Pastol Bay to the mouth of Kotlik River, Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. On page 13, at the end of line 22, after the word "dollars," I move to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not exceeding \$1,000 thereof may be used for clearing to a depth of 10 feet the channel or cut between the main channel of the river to the Carolina Beach pier.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 3, after line 14, I move to insert:

Improving Weymouth Fore River, Mass., below Quincy Point Bridge, in accordance with the report submitted January 31, 1911, \$140,000.

Mr. President, that amendment would have been offered during the hearing by the committee if it had not been for the delay in receiving the report. The report has only been sent to the Speaker to-day. I hold it in my hand. It was forwarded by the Secretary of War, to whom it was submitted, for transmission to Congress by the Chief of Engineers. He says:

I concur with the district officer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors that this further improvement is worthy of being undertaken by the General Government, and I regard it as of importance that the full amount of the estimate be made available in a single appropriation.

I will explain in a very few words the necessity for the appropriation and why it was sent in at this time. The Fore River yard, where many of our battleships are built, is on this stream. The increased size of battleships makes the straightening of the river very necessary. There was great difficulty in getting the *North Dakota* out of the river. This matter was taken up largely at the request of the Navy Department. There is a letter here from the Secretary of the Navy, in which he says:

This is of consequence to the Navy, for the reason that the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. from time to time constructs battleships for the Government, and these are liable to be in the near future of 30,000 tons displacement. If, therefore, there is not sufficient water in the river, we shall lose one of our bidders and one of the Navy's resources in the way of shipbuilding.

There is building there at this moment one of the Argentine battleships. If this improvement is not made it is not probable that we can secure further contracts for the building of foreign battleships. It is therefore very important on this account. Besides that, there is a large commerce on this arm of the sea. But this is the need for immediate action, and it is recommended by the department. It has come through the regular channel, and it would have been adopted in the regular way if it could have been submitted at an earlier date.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that he have those papers printed in the Record.

Mr. LODGE. These are the original papers which were sent to the Speaker, and they will be printed as a document to-morrow morning.

Mr. NELSON. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. I was allowed to take them from the files simply to present them to the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. I am familiar with the locality, and have no objection whatever to the amendment which the Senator from Massachusetts proposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. On page 43, after line 16, I move to insert:

For improving the Missouri River between Le Beau, S. Dak., and Fort Benton, Mont., \$150,000, of which amount \$50,000 shall be expended at Bismarck, N. Dak., \$20,000 for repairing and improving the revetment on the east side of the river, and \$30,000 for repairing and improving the dike on the west side of the river.

Mr. FRYE. This survey may have been made, but there has been no report from the engineers or the board of review.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is a point of order made against the amendment?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will state that we appropriated for a survey in 1909. There has been sufficient time. The report has really been made, but it has never been submitted. I understand that the work has been done, but it has never been submitted. From the investigation which I have made all along the river of the \$150,000 that was appropriated last year, only about \$15,000 has been actually expended at the present time. I ask that so much of the amount as may be necessary may be used. From information I get by telegraphic communication and otherwise it will require about \$50,000 at Bismarck, N. Dak., and if the other is not necessary it will not be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 31856. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 32010. An act to create a tariff board, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I move that that bill be referred to the Committee on Finance. I have been informed that the Committee on Finance will meet on Friday to consider this measure and that it will have prompt attention. I am sure there will be an early report.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 12 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1911.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

Col. Robert K. Evans, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be brigadier general from January 30, 1911, vice Brig. Gen. Charles L. Hodges, who accepted an appointment as major general January 28, 1911.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Everett Martin Balcom, of New Hampshire, late second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, United States Army, to be second lieutenant from January 27, 1911, to fill an existing vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Albert L. Rhoades, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from January 29, 1911, vice Capt. Peter C. Hains, jr., resigned January 28, 1911.

Second Lieut. Harry R. Vaughan, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 29, 1911, vice First Lieut. Albert L. Rhoades, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

MARINE CORPS.

Col. William P. Biddle to be Major General Commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Clyde B. Walker, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Juneau, Alaska, for the term of four years from January 10, 1910, when he was confirmed as "temporary, pending regular appointment."

David J. Girard, of California, to be register of the land office at Eureka, Cal., his term having expired January 28, 1911. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry G. McCrossen, of Wisconsin, to be receiver of public moneys at Wausau, Wis., his term having expired January 10, 1911. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

George D. Cunningham to be postmaster at Riverside, Cal., in place of George D. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

Orlando J. Lincoln to be postmaster at Santa Cruz, Cal., in place of Orlando J. Lincoln. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1911.

William A. Price to be postmaster at Redwood City, Cal., in place of William A. Price. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

Linn L. Shaw to be postmaster at Santa Ana, Cal., in place of Linn L. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

John W. Short to be postmaster at Fresno, Cal., in place of John W. Short. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1911.

William L. Williams to be postmaster at Madera, Cal., in place of William L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1911.

CONNECTICUT.

Ira E. Hicks to be postmaster at New Britain, Conn., in place of Ira E. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1911.

Courtland C. Potter to be postmaster at Mystic, Conn., in place of Courtland C. Potter. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1911.

Frederick L. Scott to be postmaster at Farmington, Conn., in place of Frederick L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1911.

COLORADO.

J. A. Smith to be postmaster at Stratton, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

FLORIDA.

Mary B. Bishop to be postmaster at Eustis, Fla., in place of Mary B. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1911.

Frank L. Collins to be postmaster at Winterhaven, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

George E. Koons to be postmaster at Palmetto, Fla., in place of George E. Koons. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1911.

Millard M. Owens to be postmaster at Bonifay, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

GEORGIA.

Clifford H. Dyar to be postmaster at Adairsville, Ga., in place of Clifford H. Dyar. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1911.

Frank P. Mitchell to be postmaster at Americus, Ga., in place of Frank P. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

William E. Perry to be postmaster at Donalsonville, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

IDAHO.

C. D. McEachron to be postmaster at Lewiston, Idaho, in place of C. D. McEachron. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1911.

Daniel C. Burr to be postmaster at Genesee, Idaho, in place of Thalia L. Owen, resigned.

Orville J. Butler to be postmaster at Harrison, Idaho, in place of Orville J. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1911.

W. Van Iorns to be postmaster at Hagerman, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

ILLINOIS.

A. Leslie Bowling to be postmaster at Equality, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Edward D. Cook to be postmaster at Piper City, Ill., in place of Edward D. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires February 20, 1911.

William L. Jones to be postmaster at Lebanon, Ill., in place of John C. Loudon, deceased.

Frank G. Robinson to be postmaster at El Paso, Ill., in place of Frank G. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1911.

Thomas H. Stokes to be postmaster at Lincoln, Ill., in place of Thomas H. Stokes. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

Leone M. Weir to be postmaster at Rantoul, Ill., in place of Joseph C. Weir, resigned.

INDIANA.

Edward Patton to be postmaster at Veedersburg, Ind., in place of Edward Patton. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

IOWA.

James M. Burroughs to be postmaster at Springville, Iowa, in place of Orrin E. Crane, resigned.

George W. Irwin to be postmaster at Merrill, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Benjamin H. Tamplin to be postmaster at Hull, Iowa, in place of Benjamin H. Tamplin. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

Preston T. Waples to be postmaster at Castana, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1910.

KANSAS.

Elmer Alban to be postmaster at Westphalia, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Paul O. Coons to be postmaster at Spring Hill, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Irving Hill to be postmaster at Lawrence, Kans., in place of Irving Hill. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1911.

Fred C. Oehler to be postmaster at Cherryvale, Kans., in place of Thomas H. Earnest. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1911.

KENTUCKY.

Belle Flanery to be postmaster at Prestonsburg, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

Leonard Scott to be postmaster at Deer River, Minn., in place of Murry J. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1911.

MISSOURI.

C. E. Oden to be postmaster at Cainesville, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

MONTANA.

Melvin Rowe to be postmaster at Cascade, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

NEBRASKA.

Nellie Strain to be postmaster at Chester, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

NEW JERSEY.

James F. Beardsley to be postmaster at Pompton Lakes, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

Joseph Miller to be postmaster at Salem, N. J., in place of Joseph Miller. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1911.

NEW YORK.

John B. Alexander to be postmaster at Oswego, N. Y., in place of John B. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expires February 6, 1911.

Andrew D. Annable to be postmaster at Otego, N. Y., in place of Andrew D. Annable. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1911.

Adelbert E. Brace to be postmaster at Jordan, N. Y., in place of James E. Peck. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1911.

OHIO.

Loui C. Burnham to be postmaster at Milford Center, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

John Carroll to be postmaster at West Lafayette, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

James A. Downs to be postmaster at Scio, Ohio, in place of James A. Downs. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1911.

A. G. Eldemiller to be postmaster at West Milton, Ohio, in place of Wirt Kessler. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1911.

John C. Rock to be postmaster at West Liberty, Ohio, in place of John C. Rock. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1911.

OKLAHOMA.

Noah S. Costelou to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

A. M. Myers to be postmaster at Lexington, Okla., in place of John H. Asbury, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William F. Brittain to be postmaster at Muncy, Pa., in place of William F. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1911.

Howard E. Butz to be postmaster at Huntingdon, Pa., in place of Howard E. Butz. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1911.

Harold C. Carpenter to be postmaster at Troy, Pa., in place of Harold C. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1911.

Frederick T. Gelder to be postmaster at Forest City, Pa., in place of Frederick T. Gelder. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1911.

John B. Griffiths to be postmaster at Jermyn, Pa., in place of John B. Griffiths. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1911.

Frank E. Hollar to be postmaster at Shippensburg, Pa., in place of Frank E. Hollar. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

Winfred W. Marsh to be postmaster at Westfield, Pa., in place of Edwin S. Holcomb. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1909.

John S. Read to be postmaster at Factoryville, Pa., in place of John S. Read. Incumbent's commission expires February 15, 1911.

John H. Thomas to be postmaster at Carbondale, Pa., in place of John H. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1911.

David M. Turner to be postmaster at Towanda, Pa., in place of David M. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1911.

John S. Weaver to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of John S. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Benjamin J. Hammet to be postmaster at Blackville, S. C., in place of Benjamin J. Hammet. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1910.

Guss E. Smith to be postmaster at Mullins, S. C., in place of Guss E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1911.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Cyrus B. Williamson to be postmaster at Watertown, S. Dak., in place of Cyrus B. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1910.

TEXAS.

William G. McClain to be postmaster at Waxahachie, Tex., in place of William G. McClain. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1911.

Seth B. Strong to be postmaster at Houston, Tex., in place of Seth B. Strong. Incumbent's commission expires February 13, 1911.

VIRGINIA.

J. W. Hubbard to be postmaster at Honaker, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

James H. Sumpter to be postmaster at Floyd, Va., in place of James H. Sumpter. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

WASHINGTON.

Fremont A. Tarr to be postmaster at Montesano, Wash., in place of Fremont A. Tarr. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1911.

Frank R. Wright to be postmaster at South Bend, Wash., in place of Frank R. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Frank S. Smith to be postmaster at Parkersburg, W. Va., in place of Frank S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1911.

WISCONSIN.

Justin Means to be postmaster at Merrill, Wis., in place of Christian N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1910.

Albert H. Tarnutzer to be postmaster at Prairie du Sac, Wis., in place of Albert H. Tarnutzer. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1911.

Albert J. Topp to be postmaster at Waterford, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1909.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1911.

COMMERCE COURT.

William H. Hunt to be additional circuit judge of the United States from the ninth judicial circuit and designated to serve for three years in the Commerce Court.

Robert Wodrow Archbald to be additional circuit judge of the United States from the third judicial circuit and designated to serve for four years in the Commerce Court.

John Emmet Carland to be additional circuit judge of the United States from the eighth judicial circuit and designated to serve for two years in the Commerce Court.

Julian W. Mack to be additional circuit judge of the United States from the seventh judicial circuit and designated to serve for one year in the Commerce Court.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Walter I. Smith to be circuit judge, eighth circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Frank H. Rudkin to be district judge for the eastern district of Washington.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Alfred E. Holton to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

Edward Engerud to be United States attorney, district of North Dakota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Sidney E. Hawley to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

George B. Rives to be secretary of the embassy at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

UNITED STATES PENSION AGENT.

John R. King to be pension agent at Washington, D. C.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Palmer E. Anderson, Princeton.
Samuel G. Enloe, Mulberry Grove.
Peter A. Nelson, Lemont.
Otis E. Stumpf, Findlay.
Frank L. Wilkins, St. Anne.

INDIANA.

Lewis C. Johnson, Hartford City.

KANSAS.

J. M. Cannon, Cunningham.

NEBRASKA.

Cary K. Cooper, Humboldt.
Irvin B. Jeffries, Pilger.
Ira E. Tash, Alliance.
Asa B. Wood, Gering.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Joseph W. Shidler, Marianna.
John S. Wilson, Columbia.

TENNESSEE.

George M. Book, Tullahoma.
Ira Marshall Colle, Jefferson City.
M. H. Edmondson, Maryville.
Cary F. Spence, Knoxville.

UTAH.

John A. Smith, Heber.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Fannie E. Helmick, Thomas.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 31, 1911.

L. L. Thayer to be postmaster at Bloomer, Wis.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 31, 1911.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick C. Harper, of Washington, to be collector of customs for the district of Puget Sound, in the State of Washington. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 31, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, on the request of Mr. RUCKER of Colorado, reference of House resolution 933, relating to wireless telegraphy, was changed from the Committee on Naval Affairs to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 10357. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to David Eddington covering homestead entry;

S. 10268. An act granting to the Ozark Power & Water Co. authority to construct a dam across White River, Mo.;

S. 574. An act to authorize J. W. Vance, L. L. Allen, C. F. Helwig, and H. V. Worley, of Pierce City, Mo.; A. B. Durnil, D. H. Kemp, Sig Solomon, J. J. Davis, S. A. Chappell, and W. M. West, of Monett, Mo.; M. L. Coleman, M. T. Davis, Jared R. Woodfill, jr., J. H. Jarrett, and William H. Standish, of Aurora, Lawrence County, Mo.; and L. S. Meyer, F. S. Heffernan, Robert A. Moore, William H. Johnson, J. P. McCammon, M. W. Colbaugh, and W. H. Schreiber, of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., to construct a dam across the James River in Stone County, Mo., and to divert a portion of its waters through a tunnel into the said river again to create electric power;

S. 8084. An act to provide mail receptacles at places of business, and for other purposes;

S. 6991. An act to authorize the compilation of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary War, with a view of their publication;

S. 10052. An act to provide American register for the steamer *Minnesota* upon certain conditions;

S. 8875. An act to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon;

S. 9331. An act to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes;

S. 9351. An act to provide for the retirement of officers of the Medical Reserve Corps; and

S. 9903. An act to authorize the Sheridan Railway & Light Co. to construct and operate railway, telegraph, telephone, electric power, and trolley lines through the Fort Mackenzie Military Reservation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bills of the following titles:

H. R. 20109. An act to quiet title to certain land in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.;

H. R. 15660. An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries;

H. R. 25235. An act to provide for the sale of lands acquired under the provisions of the reclamation act, and which are needed for the purposes of that act; and

H. R. 15665. An act providing for the appointment of deputy clerks to the United States circuit court of appeals.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8084. An act to provide mail receptacles at places of business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 6991. An act to authorize the compilation of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary War, with a view of their publication; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 10052. An act to provide American register for the steamer *Minnesota* upon certain conditions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 8875. An act to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 9331. An act to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 9351. An act to provide for the retirement of officers of the Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 574. An act to authorize J. W. Vance, L. L. Allen, C. F. Helwig, and H. V. Worley, of Pierce City, Mo.; A. B. Durnil, D. H. Kemp, Sig Soloman, J. J. Davis, S. A. Chappell, and W. M. West, of Monett, Mo.; M. L. Coleman, M. T. Davis, Jared R. Woodfill, Jr., J. H. Jarrett, and William H. Standish, of Aurora, Lawrence County, Mo.; and L. S. Meyer, F. S. Heffernan, Robert A. Moore, William H. Johnson, J. P. McCammon, M. W. Colbaugh, and W. H. Schreiber, of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., to construct a dam across the James River in Stone County, Mo., and to divert a portion of its waters through a tunnel into the said river again to create electric power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 9903. An act to authorize the Sheridan Railway & Light Co. to construct and operate railway, telegraph, telephone, electric power, and trolley lines through the Fort Mackenzie Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 10357. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to David Eddington covering homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—SMITH V. MASSEY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House testimony in the contested-election case of Smith v. Massey, which was referred to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

BRIDGE ACROSS TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MISS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 10304) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Iron Wood Bluff, in Itawamba County, Miss., two similar House bills being upon the calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation near Iron Wood Bluff, in Itawamba County, Miss., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The question was taken, and the bill ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bills H. R. 27292 and H. R. 31928, of similar title, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto. (H. Rept. No. 2019.)

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from consideration of the bill and Senate amendments, that the House disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Pending that, I would like to make just a suggestion. This bill comes over from the Senate with between two and three hundred amendments, many of them, of course, very insignificant. I assume that the House does not care now to discuss or to consider these amendments, inasmuch as we recommend that they be all disagreed to and go to conference. I would be glad to hear any suggestions which might be made by Members who yesterday objected to sending the bill to conference at that time, and who, perhaps, had some amendments in mind. I presume we could come to some agreement by which there would be no objection to my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from consideration of the Senate amendments to the legislative appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say my object in having this go back to the committee was that we might get some understanding in reference to some of these amendments. I realize with the gentleman from Massachusetts that there are some two or three hundred amendments, most of them increases of salaries, placed in the bill since it has left the House. While I do not desire to

delay the sending of this bill to conference, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts for the privilege, if we desire to do so, of having a separate vote upon the amendment increasing the salary of the Secretary to the President from \$6,000 to \$10,000. There is also an amendment increasing the number of assistant secretaries to the Department of Commerce and Labor, and also an amendment establishing an assay office in the State of North Carolina. This may be necessary, but I want to know it. These, to my mind, present some reason why I thought the House ought to have an opportunity of voting upon them. I feel that on some of these increases, and some Members have spoken to me about the matter, the House ought to have a right to vote upon them if it should so desire, and if we could agree with the chairman of this committee that he would give us a vote upon these amendments, and possibly two or three I have not mentioned and which will be indicated by other Members, I have no objection to its going to conference without being referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on the part of the committee to preclude the House from voting on amendments which it considers important, and I am ready to agree that we will come back with a disagreement on the amendments the gentleman specified, so that the House may have an opportunity to vote upon them, and I think the chances are we will come back with a disagreement on a great many others, but I am willing to meet the gentleman in this way.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. There are a few other increases of salary in the bill which I would like to have an opportunity to take up in the House and have a vote upon; I can not mention all of them. I do not know I will be able to specify and I do not know whether there are any others on which I should like to ask for a vote, but the committee might come back with an agreement on all, or may come back with an agreement on a large number of them, and what we want is an opportunity to permit the House to vote upon those indicated.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman appreciates I have been fairly willing to cut down on the appropriations, and I am quite likely to be in sympathy with the gentleman on a great many of them. I will undertake to agree that on those the gentleman has specified we shall come back and the House will have an opportunity to vote upon them. Probably there will be a great many more.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have an understanding with the gentleman upon two or three amendments. One I understand increases the salary of the Secretary to the President from \$6,000 to \$10,000.

Mr. GILLETT. I agree that the gentleman shall have a chance to vote upon them.

Mr. MACON. To have a vote on it here before it is agreed to.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MACON. The other is the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. GILLETT. Well, I will agree to that.

Mr. MACON. Then, I want to ask the gentleman if the Senate has attempted to increase the salary of the official stenographers of the House.

Mr. GILLETT. They have.

Mr. MACON. If so, I desire to have a separate vote upon that proposition.

Mr. GILLETT. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. MACON. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman now state in what respect he has modified his request in harmony with the various conversations held, for the Chair is unable to put the request to the House?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make some inquiry about certain increases, and, as the gentleman from Illinois well said, it is a very difficult matter to specify exactly what we do want to inquire about. But I want to call the gentleman's attention to an increase of salaries, on page 28 of the bill, of official stenographers and reporters of debates from \$5,000 to \$6,000 each. What is the purpose of that?

Mr. GILLETT. The Senate did it. I did not know anything about it until it was put on in the Senate.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I want to make an inquiry about another item here, namely, four stenographers to committee, and increasing the salary from \$5,000 to \$6,000 each. What four committees does that comprise?

Mr. GILLETT. Let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. TAWNEY. Four committee stenographers.

Mr. GILLETT. They are not stenographers to any particular committee, but they go before the committees when the com-

mittees have hearings and report them. This was put on by the Senate without any knowledge or suggestion of mine at all.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What would be the gentleman's disposition as to giving the House an opportunity to vote on that?

Mr. GILLETT. I am willing. That is fair.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to an increase of the salary of the Secretary of State here; also an increase of the salary of the governor of New Mexico, and, I believe, of Arizona. What will the gentleman say about that? I understand that their salaries are fixed by law, and yet I find an increase of their salaries here of something like \$500 or \$1,000 a year. Now, what will the gentleman say as to whether or not he will give the House a chance to vote on that increase?

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think that important? It is an increase of only \$500.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Small matters may or may not be important, but it is an open violation of the law, as I understand it, inasmuch as their salaries are now being fixed by law and you can not appropriate more than the salary so fixed.

Mr. GILLETT. I will say to the gentleman I have not looked at that. We have disagreed to all the Senate amendments.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What would be the gentleman's disposition, when he finds that salary increase, about giving the House a chance to vote upon it?

Mr. GILLETT. My disposition would be to oppose the increase.

Mr. COX of Indiana. And give the House a chance to vote upon it?

Mr. GILLETT. That would be my disposition. I would not agree to it unless the gentleman insists. Of course, there are some things that we have to give up, and it does not seem to me that is an important matter to make an agreement about.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The only thing about the importance of the matter is the amount given in these increases.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman must remember we have to get through with this session of Congress.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I remember that.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman will also remember that a conference between the two Houses, in order to be a conference at all, should be a free conference. It is a little embarrassing to commit conferees on the part of the House, before joining their associates in the other branch in conference, to any defined policy. The chairman of the conferees on the part of the House has already said that an opportunity will be given for a separate vote on all of the items mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foster], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Macon].

Mr. COX of Indiana. With that understanding, I have no objection to the gentleman's request. However, I want to call attention to the Director of the Mint also.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to have an explicit understanding, Mr. Speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged, that the House disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference, with the understanding that the House shall have an opportunity to vote on the increase of salary of the Secretary to the President, upon the increase of the salaries of the stenographers, and upon the increase of the salaries of the assistants of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. I hope in other matters the House will trust the conferees not to be bound, but to use our best judgment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are a number of salaries in this bill. The gentleman seems desirous to have an explicit statement as to which will be brought back and disagreed to.

A gentleman who is about to be appointed a conferee can hardly put himself in that attitude and then go into a free conference; but, knowing the attitude of the committee and of those who will represent the House on the conference, I think I can say that Members are safe in resting in the assurance that the conferees will not yield upon many of these matters, if at all, until at least they have been brought back in disagreement once. No one who is about to be appointed a conferee will desire to go into the conference, having made that statement in the House; but we should realize that the Senate amendments show a disposition to follow a policy contrary to the attitude of the committee and of the House, and I think it unwise to attempt to bind the gentleman from Massachusetts to a specific statement regarding any particular increases of salary in this bill.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Oh, no; there are some 200 and more increases, and we are only asking about three or four of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; there are not 200 increases. There are 230 amendments, many of them verbal, many of them changes of punctuation, many changes of phraseology. The great bulk of them are not material, but upon the material amendments it is quite certain that gentlemen will come back here and disagree.

Mr. CARY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. If you intend to bring in the increases mentioned, I would also ask that you include the Bureau of Printing and Engraving in that list, especially the Director, at \$1,000 a year.

Mr. MANN. Has that been inserted by the Senate?

Mr. CARY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARY. Just a minute. Will you include that?

Mr. GILLETT. I would rather not be tied down to that.

Mr. CARY. You have mentioned some others.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We will bring it back, so you can vote on it.

Mr. CARY. I want it understood now that the Bureau of Printing and Engraving increases in salaries will be included and considered on the floor of the House. There are a good many of these increases put in by the Senate that the House would not stand for.

Mr. GILLETT. We expect to oppose a great many of them, but I do not like to go into conference and be bound any more than necessary beforehand.

Mr. CARY. That is \$1,000, and several matters of \$500 have been mentioned, and there are several other \$1,000 items.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to my colleague that whether we approve or disapprove of these amendments they will all come back in our report and you can vote on every one of them?

Mr. CARY. If that is the understanding—

Mr. GILLETT. You can not do that as to those which are included in the agreement of the conferees without upsetting the report.

Mr. MANN. No; you can not vote on all of them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I mean all those on which a disagreement is reported.

Mr. MANN. Let us have the request submitted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from consideration of the Senate amendments to the legislative bill, disagree to the amendments, and ask for a conference. There has been some conversation amongst gentlemen—

Mr. CARY. I want it understood as to those items about the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I will object if you do not agree to that.

Mr. GILLETT. All right; I will agree to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will please state briefly in substance—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, before requiring that to be done, I would suggest that it is a matter of understanding between the Members of the House here but is not a part of the request that is made by the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. That would absolutely destroy the possibility of a free conference if that was a part of the request. It will appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD will speak for the conversation.

Mr. CARY. You say you have that understanding as to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we want to know something about what the agreement is. It is utterly impossible to hear what gentlemen are saying.

The SPEAKER. All gentlemen will be seated, and Members when addressing the House will address the House from their seats or from the area in front of the Clerk's desk, under the rule. The Sergeant at Arms will request gentlemen in the middle aisle to be seated. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I simply wanted to suggest that, while the conversation which has occurred here between gentlemen may appear in the RECORD to-morrow, that might be too late for gentlemen who did not hear it, but who might want to take exception to it.

Unless we know what the agreement is beyond this simple request, I propose to object. If there is nothing but the simple request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not object;

but if there is some agreement entered into between gentlemen without the knowledge of the House, I do propose to object to said arrangement.

Mr. GILLETT. There is no agreement. There was an understanding that there were a few items that should come back to the House so that the House should have an opportunity to vote upon them separately.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. GILLETT, Mr. GRAFF, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. BURKETT, and Mr. FOSTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PANAMA CANAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. DALZELL. I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 943) from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, January 31, the House shall proceed to select for consideration either House joint resolution 213, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915 at San Francisco, Cal., or H. R. 29362, to provide for celebrating the completion and opening of the Panama Canal by the United States by holding an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forest, and sea in the city of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, as the House may determine. There shall be one hour's debate, the time to be equally divided between the advocates of the respective measures. At the end of an hour, in order to determine which measure shall be considered, the roll shall be called and each Member shall respond, naming "San Francisco" if he votes for H. R. 29362, and "New Orleans" if he votes for H. R. 29362. Consideration of the measure selected shall then be entered upon in the House, and at 4 o'clock p. m. the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill or resolution and pending amendments to final passage.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule is to afford an opportunity to the House to determine between the rival claims of New Orleans and San Francisco for Government recognition of the Panama Canal Exposition to be held in 1915.

On the 16th of June last the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported to this House a resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915 at San Francisco, Cal., and that resolution has been on the calendar of the House ever since. On the 24th of January, one week ago to-day, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions reported to the House a bill to provide for celebrating the completion and opening of the Panama Canal by the United States, to hold an international exposition of arts, industries, manufactures, of products of the soil, mines, forests, and sea, in the city of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

Each of the parties having this legislation in charge invoked the help of the Committee on Rules to secure consideration of their bill, in one case a joint resolution and in the other case a House bill. Each of them was willing that the case should be so presented to the House that it might make choice between them if means could be devised to that end. It was first suggested to the Committee on Rules that one proposition might be reported with leave to offer the other as a substitute, but neither party was willing to have its proposition serve as a substitute. Thereupon the committee decided upon the form of the rule which has just been read to the House.

The rule provides that after an hour's debate the roll shall be called and the Member determining which of these propositions he wants to vote for shall respond in the one case San Francisco and in the other case New Orleans. Upon the determination of the measure which the House sees fit to adopt it shall then be considered, and at 4 o'clock the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill or resolution and pending amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. DALZELL. It is.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman what provision has been made for those of us who oppose any exposition.

Mr. DALZELL. They will have to vote in the negative on the proposition that is selected by the House.

Mr. GILLETT. How will we vote on the first proposition?

Mr. DALZELL. Just as the gentleman may decide.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON. This is a question of consideration?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes. Does my colleague want any time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not see any use in discussing this rule. Let the fellows that want to present the case get to the bat at once. [Laughter.] This is a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman, under the rule, is it permissible for a Member to vote "present" if paired?

Mr. DALZELL. I should say that it was.

Mr. MANN. The rule says that he shall vote for New Orleans or San Francisco.

Mr. DALZELL. The rules of the House say that every Member shall vote in all cases, but Members exercise their right not to.

Mr. MANN. I just wanted to understand the situation.

Mr. DALZELL. I have no doubt the gentleman from Illinois knows how he will vote.

Mr. MANN. No; I have not determined.

Mr. DALZELL. Then I am sorry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DALZELL. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman whether, under the rule as presented, an opportunity may be given for those who do not desire to vote for San Francisco or New Orleans to have their votes recorded.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know of any way under the rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The committee take the unusual position of presenting the matter not for a yea-and-nay vote, and the Member must respond for one or the other of the two cities.

There are some Members of the House, I suspect, who would like to vote for a third city. My question is, Is it possible under the rule to vote for a third city and to have that vote recorded?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that under the parliamentary situation the Committee on Rules has no jurisdiction over any proposed legislation except that which was sent to it, and there has been nothing sent to the committee proposing any other city or any other legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I desire to inform the gentleman that there was a bill before both committees, that on Foreign Affairs and that on Industrial Arts and Expositions, favoring Washington, D. C. I think we can get at the point I am inquiring about if the gentleman will say whether he will accept an amendment to the motion as made by him for the Committee on Rules, inserting the name of the city of Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, and giving Members the option of voting for that city, if they so desire.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I have no authority to accept any such amendment. There has been no bill reported in favor of the city of Washington or any other city, and there has been no request sent to the Committee on Rules to take up legislation relating to any other than these two cities.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have already stated that such a bill was introduced and that there was a hearing actually had before the two committees to which I have referred, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That I may offer an amendment—

Mr. DALZELL. I do not yield for that purpose. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know whether, under the rule as now agreed to, it will be possible for a Member who desires to vote for a city not named in the rule to vote for that city, and whether he may expect to have that vote recorded.

The SPEAKER. All things are possible, almost, to Members of the House, touching voting or not voting.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then a Member may vote, if he pleases, for a third city—one not named in the resolution?

The SPEAKER. He might mention Hongkong, it occurs to the Chair, if he so desires. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Chair was good enough to rule upon the parliamentary inquiry, but there were a number of gentlemen at this side of the House who did not catch the Chair's reply.

The SPEAKER. Oh, it was hardly a ruling; it was merely announcing the legislative and individual liberty of an American citizen, including a Member of the House of Representatives. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the Chair for that declaration of independence.

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Speaker, before taking up this matter I would like to ask unanimous consent in behalf of the gentlemen who desire to speak in this connection that they may have for five legislative days the privilege of printing their remarks in the Record on the subject that is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days from to-day in which to print remarks upon this subject.

Mr. MANN. Does that extend to all Members or Members who speak to-day?

Mr. FASSETT. My request was that all Members may print on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman who represents those who reported the House bill what will be his wish as to the division of the time.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, under the rule that has just been reported, both of these propositions before the House are affirmative in character and stand on an equal footing. Inasmuch as the resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs was reported first and is mentioned first in the rule, I believe that the gentlemen advocating San Francisco should consume their half hour consecutively, especially inasmuch as I expect to consume the entire half hour allotted to New Orleans.

Mr. FASSETT. The gentleman expects to begin and conclude his remarks in one speech?

Mr. RODENBERG. Yes.

Mr. FASSETT. Would it be objectionable if after we have consumed 20 minutes of our time for the gentleman then to present his case?

Mr. RODENBERG. It seems to me that is not a reasonable request under the wording of the rule. There is nothing but the affirmative side of this proposition.

Mr. FASSETT. It seems to me if we use 20 or 25 minutes in presenting our case, and then the gentleman presents his case in one consecutive speech, it would not be unfair to leave us five or 10 minutes in which to make reply to some point to which the gentleman may have referred.

Mr. RODENBERG. Well, I have no objection to it. I will agree to that.

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Speaker, the early years of the twentieth century will always be notable for two events of transcendent interest and importance—the building of the Panama Canal by the people of the United States and the rebuilding of San Francisco by the inhabitants of a single city.

Each represents in money cost more than \$300,000,000.

One is the expression of the wealth, power, and high purpose of a great Nation; the other a manifestation of the dauntless faith of an American city. [Applause.]

No American can view either event without a thrill of increased pride in both.

The canal was undertaken because of our Pacific coasts.

It was inspired by a double purpose:

First, to bring naval protection nearer to our coast cities;

Second, to open an avenue for the extension and expansion of our salt-water commerce.

No city in the world has a more vital interest in the Panama Canal than San Francisco.

Its successful operation means to her better protection in times of war, which we all hope may never come, and better facilities for commerce in times of peace, which we all hope may always endure.

It will bring the east coast of South America, representing five-sixths of the commercial power of that great continent, thousands of miles nearer to San Francisco.

It will mean the same for the east coast of North America and the western shores of Europe and, above all, an unbroken sea voyage for restless European home seekers. California has room and a welcome for twelve million more.

Realizing the deep significance of this completed dream of three centuries, and desiring to celebrate it in worthy fashion, San Francisco and the State and people of California have raised the princely sum of \$17,500,000 to establish and maintain the greatest industrial and commemorative exposition the world has ever seen. Blessed with an exceptional and unsurpassed climate, with boundless hospitality, and with unrivaled accommodation for multiplied thousands of visitors, they come, asking for not one single dollar of Government money and for no Government guaranties. They ask what, it seems to me, should be accorded with unanimity, that the Government of the United States will in their behalf extend their invitation to the people of all the nations of the earth to come and see and help to celebrate the greatest triumph in their history and in ours. [Applause.]

I yield the balance of my time to Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts, or, rather, I meant to yield to Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts the balance of the 20 minutes and the balance of all the time, and ask him to take charge of it to the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have never believed it to be within the proper functions of the United States Government to inaugurate or supervise expositions or to give them pecuniary aid, either in the form of loans or of gifts. Neither do I feel that the National Government ought ever to assume such a position as will create for itself a moral obligation to pay any part of the debts of an insolvent exposition company. These principles I regard as fundamental.

If Congress passes the New Orleans bill now pending, it will be passed without my vote, for it violates in large part the fundamental principles which I have just stated. Moreover, it appropriates \$1,000,000 for a Government exhibit. This, to my mind, is inadvisable for many reasons, although, unfortunately, by no means unprecedented.

By the terms of the New Orleans bill, through a commission appointed by the President, the United States is charged with the duty of rendering the final decision on the most important questions connected with establishing and conducting the exposition. This provision places squarely on the shoulders of the National Government the responsibility for the success or failure of the undertaking. No disclaimer, such as is contained in the text of this measure, can operate for our relief from financial liability.

Similar disclaimers were made in the bills which inaugurated the Chicago, the St. Louis, and the Jamestown Expositions. Yet they entirely failed to eradicate from men's minds the solemn belief that mere formulas can not relieve the United States from the payment of obligations incurred in the conduct of its own undertakings.

On the other hand, I shall be glad to cast my vote for the San Francisco resolution. It violates no fundamental principle; it calls for no expense on the part of the Government; its sole effect is to permit the President of the United States to act as a medium for the transmission of an invitation to foreign countries.

The responsibility is placed where the responsibility belongs. The praise will be meted out where the praise is due. The blame will be cast where the blame is earned.

Success or failure, pride or humiliation, decoration or burden, the result must rest on shoulders which have proved themselves heroically strong, the shoulders of the men of California. [Applause.]

Mr. KELIHER. Mr. Speaker, in obedience to the wish of the people of Massachusetts I intend to vote for San Francisco. [Applause.] Our people believe that in locating this exposition at San Francisco the world may pay fitting honor to the genius, perseverance, patriotism, and glory of the American people as exemplified in the splendid execution of this stupendous project, the Panama Canal, and at the same time render merited tribute to the indomitable will of the people of Frisco. Prostrated to-day by a blow that the most optimistic predicted would at least cripple her for life, on the morrow she bravely faced the most disheartening odds, and to the wonderment and admiration alike of the world she stands to-day rejuvenated, revitalized, and hopeful. Mr. Speaker, I believe no better lesson can be afforded of the fortitude and pluck of the American people than by allowing the world to go to Frisco, see that newborn city, meet and look into the faces of those intrepid and progressive

people that gave the world that magnificent exhibition of American pluck.

These considerations, rather than because of the amount of money either city or State will raise or guarantee, or because of the distance from the center of population of either city, guide me to the resurrected city on the Pacific slope, and my vote will be cast to-day for San Francisco. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House for the very bad voice with which I am addressing it this morning, but in view of the magnificent pluck and courage and spirit of American energy that has entered into the rebuilding of San Francisco by the undaunted citizens who live there, I can not refrain from trying to make a little effort in saying that I am very much in favor of that place for this exposition.

The House knows that I never have voted for one of the expositions since they have been so much in vogue in this country. I favor San Francisco because she comes here, having risen from the ashes of blasted hopes, of destroyed buildings, of burned homes, of every species of property seemingly wiped out, and presents to the world that exhibition of energy and pluck that has erected a palace city on the ruins left by the earthquake. And I also favor it because San Francisco comes here with this magnificent capital, every dollar of which seems to be available, comes here asking no aid of Congress, asking none of those insidious words of invitation going to foreign countries and coming back to us again for an appropriation because unable to pay the premiums on the goods that come here for exhibit; and I can not see the possibility of the Government of the United States ever becoming responsible for a dollar for this exposition which they propose to have there. And as the city, I believe, will receive much benefit from and is dependent upon this magnificent canal that we are constructing, her every interest linked with the success of that enterprise, with her enthusiasm, her zeal, her energy, and her pluck, I can not think but that an exposition there will be a great and magnificent success. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of San Francisco. [Applause.] San Francisco has given an example to the world of the cooperation of capital and labor, of a condition where the employer is not a master and the employee is not a slave, and out of the combined efforts growing from a condition of that kind we have the splendid results of a city magnificent destroyed, wiped out of existence, and then rebuilt more magnificently than it previously existed. Because of those conditions, and because of the fact that San Francisco is the ideal place, under the circumstances, for an exposition of this kind, because of the fact that it will show the bringing together of the Atlantic and Pacific more conclusively than if the exposition were held anywhere else, I favor San Francisco as the place of holding the exposition. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Missouri and the members of practically all the great business organizations of St. Louis have asked me to cast my vote for New Orleans. Not that they are against San Francisco, but they are for the southern city because St. Louis and New Orleans are linked together by a thousand commercial ties as well as by the greatest river of the continent, in the improvement of which they are both equally interested. We also remember with gratitude that when the initial steps were taken for the greatest of all world's fairs ever held, namely, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, the good people of Louisiana and their representatives here were the first to extend to us their moral and material support.

But Mr. Speaker, these are, after all, but selfish reasons, which, from a national standpoint, do not rise above the level of the motives which prompt the transcontinental railroad lines, for instance, or the New York proprietor of a San Francisco theater, or the New York publisher of a San Francisco newspaper, to exert their influence here in behalf of the Golden Gate City. Such selfish considerations should no more be permitted to determine the choice of Congress than political reasons or considerations of party expediency.

I am for New Orleans, because the event which it is proposed to celebrate by an exposition is the completion of the Panama Canal. If we were asked to express national admiration for the pluck and enterprise of the people of San Francisco which made that city rise, after its partial destruction by earthquake and fire, like a phoenix from the ashes, or if we were to celebrate the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands as American

territory, or the growing importance of the Pacific Ocean, of which Alexander von Humboldt said more than 50 years ago, that in time it would wrest the commercial supremacy from the Atlantic—if, I say, such were the propositions here, any one of them would prompt me to give San Francisco my enthusiastic support. But, Mr. Speaker, I insist that a celebration, on account of the Panama Canal, belongs geographically, justly, and logically to New Orleans. To locate it elsewhere would be an injustice, an affront, and an insult to the people of that city, inasmuch as we would be robbing them of something which is rightfully theirs. The canal is at their very doors. A few additional days will enable the thousands who will visit the exposition to also view the canal, and, in fact, the Panama Canal itself would be by far the greatest attraction of the New Orleans exposition as an example and a demonstration to the wondering eyes of the people of our own and other countries of the limitless possibilities of American enterprise and engineering skill.

I understand that the representatives of the Crescent City have fully satisfied a majority of the committee which has had this matter in charge of their ability, financial and other, to make this exposition one worthy of the occasion, but even if such were not the case, even if the people of New Orleans were totally indifferent as to the undertaking, that city would, to my mind, be the proper location for a Panama Canal celebration, if Congress and the Nation had once determined that the completion of that great American work should be fittingly celebrated. But as it is, our southern friends are not only willing but anxious to be the hosts of the Nation, and have raised all the money necessary for the purpose. They are not asking Congress for a subsidy, but merely wish the National Government to make an exhibit and pay for it, while, on the other hand, San Francisco proposes that all foreign nations be invited to make exhibits without, at the same time, making provision for Uncle Sam himself to be represented. I am frank to say, Mr. Speaker, that if all things were equal as to the two cities this fatal omission in San Francisco's plans alone would be sufficient to determine my vote in favor of New Orleans.

And just a word more. Who but the wealthy can afford to travel clear across the continent to the Pacific Ocean? And that class, let me suggest to my San Francisco friends, will not come, because they are surfeited with shows through their travels to the countries of Europe. A fair at New Orleans, however, would be a fair of the plain people, within the reach and means of the middle class as well as the great masses. Not only would it attract Latin America and spread before the eyes of our southern neighbors American manufactures and the products of our fields and forests and factories, with a view to strengthening and increasing our commercial relations with them, but it would also enable our own people, I say again, the plain people, to draw profitable lessons, as they did in Chicago and St. Louis, from the great and growing achievements of modern civilization.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, which prompt me to cast my vote for New Orleans.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, the question of a place at which to hold the exposition in honor of the completion of the Panama Canal is an important one. The claims of New Orleans and San Francisco have been well stated in the majority and minority report (No. 1989). The former city has raised the sum of \$8,000,000 and the latter \$17,500,000. New Orleans feels that the Government should erect its own buildings, at a cost of about \$1,000,000, while San Francisco asserts that nothing will be asked nor expected.

There is no question as to the desirability of both places. In favor of the Queen City of the South it may be said that it is much closer to the canal and is nearer the center of population of the country. This would make that city more available. However, on the other hand, San Francisco is the metropolis of the Pacific coast, in the center of a wonderfully thriving country but partially developed, and capable of supporting 40,000,000 of people, the city that phoenixlike has risen from the terrible catastrophe that overtook it a few years since.

The location of San Francisco makes a journey to that city for the great population of the country, as well as for European visitors whom the exposition will attract, a grand historical trip. I am constrained to support it—

First. Because of the fact that San Francisco asks no Government aid, as \$17,500,000 is conceded to be amply sufficient.

Second. The legislature of my State, New York, has passed resolutions in favor of the exposition being held in the California metropolis.

Third. The business interests of my district of more than a half a million people, have flooded me with requests in favor of the Pacific coast city.

For these reasons I am constrained to cast my vote for San Francisco.

In conclusion I desire to add the following excerpts from the report of the six minority members of the Committee on Arts and Expositions:

PROXIMITY TO THE CANAL.

We do not agree with the majority that because New Orleans is nearer to the Panama Canal than San Francisco the former should be designated as the exposition city. It is not the canal that is to be exhibited to the people of America and the world. The exposition is to be given in celebration of the opening of a new ocean highway, and that event is to be commemorated by an exhibition of the resources of America, their development, and the progress of civilization in the world. The proposed exposition is to be what its name implies, and not merely an opportunity to look upon the canal itself. It is not a question of proximity to the canal at all, but simply a question as to where the exhibition of the wealth of America and the world can be more appropriately held. Besides we are warranted in believing that more people will see the canal if the exposition is held in San Francisco than will if it be held at New Orleans, for undoubtedly a very large number of people who go to San Francisco will take occasion to pass through the canal going or returning.

LATIN-AMERICAN TRADE.

The majority of the committee have laid special stress upon the trade of Central and South America, and they seem to feel that if the exposition be held at New Orleans it will be the means of stimulating this trade. We do not wish to minimize the importance of encouraging and fostering our trade with the Latin-American Republic, but we do feel that undue emphasis is being placed upon this point as compared with the importance of stimulating and increasing our trade with the other sections of the world, and especially the trade of the Orient. The Middle West and the Atlantic seaboard have always enjoyed opportunities to cultivate commercial intercourse with the Atlantic side of Central and South America, and the opening of the Panama Canal will not alter these conditions. The combined trade of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Venezuela in 1909 was \$1,301,123,000, and that upon the Pacific side of South America was \$345,000,000. The bulk of South American trade, therefore, so far as the Mississippi Basin and the Atlantic seaboard are concerned will not be affected by the opening of the canal, but the completion of the canal will permit the west coast of our country to cultivate and enjoy a much larger portion of that trade.

ORIENTAL TRADE.

In recent years the commerce of the Orient has attracted world-wide attention, and all trade-seeking nations are exerting every effort to obtain a greater share of that commerce. America ought to occupy first place in the trade with Asia. In 1909 the trade between Japan and America amounted to \$97,000,000; the entire world trade of Japan was \$415,000,000. In 1909 our trade with China amounted to \$48,000,000 out of a combined world trade of China amounting to \$432,000,000. The manufacturers and producers of America are looking to Asia for new markets to absorb our surplus products, and through our State Department commercial agents are being sent throughout Asia to enlarge our trade and commerce. Our trade with Europe and with the Latin Republics of the South will increase along natural and settled lines, but the great field for exploitation lies in the Orient, and we can not afford to permit any opportunity to pass by that will strengthen our position in those great opening markets. At San Francisco, America and Asia can, with the greatest ease and facility, exhibit articles intended for exchange, thereby stimulating the trade between the two countries and at the same time further cement the ties of cordial friendship between America and the nations of the Far East.

A naval display in which all the navies of the world may be reviewed should occupy a prominent place in the celebration of the opening of the canal, and San Francisco in a conspicuous degree, with her splendid harbor, affords the opportunity for a magnificent naval and maritime spectacle.

In addition to the foregoing reasons why the exposition should be held at San Francisco, we feel that a trip to the Pacific coast will be of immense educational value to the people of our country. Assurances have been made that opportunity will be given for going and returning by different routes. Tens of thousands of our people will find in the exposition a justifiable inducement to make it a journey of continuous sight-seeing, and while upon the Pacific coast will be afforded rare opportunities of beholding the wonders of the West, its almost inexhaustible resources, and its boundless opportunities for development. Such a trip will be an exposition in itself and will be as profitable as a visit to the exposition grounds, where the products of the genius and skill of the earth will be displayed before their eyes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for San Francisco because the people of the State of Minnesota favor the location of this exposition in that city and because I believe that as between the two cities it is the most suitable place. I want to say, however, that before I can vote for the resolution inviting the nations of the world to participate in this exposition at San Francisco the resolution will have to be amended so as to accomplish what the gentleman from New York desires, and says will be done, namely, that there shall be entire freedom on the part of the Government of the United States from any expense in connection with the exposition in the future. [Applause.] In that connection I simply want to say that when we invite foreign nations to participate in an exposition in the United States we become responsible for the entertainment, care, and the treatment of those whom we have invited and who accept our invitation while they are taking part in that exposition.

The Government of the United States can not escape this responsibility and must provide for its exercise either now or hereafter. If the city of San Francisco is decided upon as the

location for the holding of that exposition I have an amendment which I shall offer.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the St. Louis Exposition—I speak of this simply to show Members the necessity for this amendment now—controversies between nations themselves arose as to the location of buildings, controversies as to the allotment of space, controversies over the matter of selecting the jury of award and the distribution of awards to our invited guests. The representatives of the Government of the United States were charged with the duty of determining these controversies, and those representatives were the commission created by act of Congress. It was created primarily for that purpose. Similar controversies will arise at this exposition wherever it may be held, and if held on the Pacific coast controversies of a more serious character may arise. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, if we are to invite the nations of the world to participate in this exposition we should at the same time make suitable provision for their protection while they are the guests of our Nation.

This commission should not have any control over the exposition or the exposition company, but it should be clothed with power to protect the interests of our invited guests. For these reasons I shall offer an amendment when we consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, winding your way with the course of the sun to celebrate the greatest achievement of man of all the ages, I wish to assure the traveler that the vast flock-populated plains, fertile fields of all the varieties of yield, gardens of flowers of every tint and perfume, dales, dells, and the grandest mountain scenery of the world will make the time of transit pass over quickly.

The stranger in this old-fogy part of the country is assured that his train will not be delayed more than a week at a time before the herds of buffalo will accommodate him by surrendering the right of way, nor will many days at a time pass before the antelope herds will be equally accommodating.

The aborigines with their paint and their feathers having been driven farther back into the interior, he will arrive at his destination, in all probability, with the same hair on his head he started with.

The only reminder to him of the paint will be when he reaches the gates of "The Beautiful"—I mean, of course, Denver—when he will be met and presented with a bucket of red paint and a brush and given the liberty, under proper regulation and surveillance, to proceed to "paint the town."

This I guarantee personally, and I am advised by the management that upon your arrival at San Francisco, where they never do things by halves, quarters, nor otherwise than by wholesale, you will be furnished barrels of red paint with commensurately large-sized brushes, to enable you to finish the process of painting left off at Denver. I therefore at once appeal to the incredulous, the lover of nature, the timid, and, though very few, the convivially inclined Members of the House to vote with me for the Phoenix City—San Francisco. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining out of the 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes of the 20 minutes are remaining.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS].

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, the completion of the Panama Canal will mark one of the greatest achievements in the history of mankind and ought to be fittingly celebrated. Two great cities, through their representatives, are here to-day seeking that honor. New Orleans comes with a pledge of \$8,000,000, San Francisco with \$17,500,000. Both cities are to be commended for their great enterprise and spirit, but, as we all know, the success of a great exposition of this character depends fundamentally upon the financial strength behind it.

Our Government has expended millions of dollars in inaugurating, fathering, and even guaranteeing expositions, and in a great many cases they have been failures. How much longer are we to continue this policy?

San Francisco comes forward and asks not one cent, but only the designation of her name as the place for this celebration. We all know that New Orleans at another time might, perchance, hold the center of the stage, but there are special reasons why at this particular time San Francisco commands the admiration of the whole country.

She presents to-day a splendid illustration of the true, indomitable American spirit. No other city on the American Continent has gone through the trials and tribulations which she

has. She has overcome the convulsions of nature. She has braved the fire. She has rebuilt her city. She has driven the looter and the grafter from her midst and now presents herself, a typical American city, larger and grander than ever before—rebuilt and redeemed—with plenty of money to give to this country a magnificent exposition, and simply asks the Government to put its official sanction upon her name. [Applause.]

It has been said that San Francisco is a long ways off and that New Orleans is located nearer the center of the population, and therefore on this account will be visited by more people. There is a strange perversity in our human nature that we seldom if ever visit the things near at hand. How many people have lived in sight of the Washington Monument and never have gone to its top? How many expositions in the past have used this same argument of "nearer to the center of the population" and yet have been flat failures? Distance has its charms. We can go to New Orleans any day, but San Francisco is the trip of a lifetime, and it is just for that reason that the American people will prefer to make a visit to San Francisco and will go there in larger numbers, in my judgment, than to New Orleans, and on their journey they will be able to visit the great national park, the Yosemite; Alaska, perchance; and those thriving western cities, Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland, and, returning through southern California, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and the Garden of the Gods, they will have enjoyed an exposition of our great natural resources and beauties all the way such as they could never enjoy if this exposition were placed at New Orleans.

This exposition will not be complete without the American Navy. Every American citizen realizes that it was the trip around the Horn of the *Oregon*, steaming at full speed in those anxious hours of the Spanish-American War, that focused public attention and public thought upon the necessity for building the Panama Canal, and when this great exposition is held in San Francisco I would like to see this same ship, accompanied by a fleet of greater ships, since built, steam from the Atlantic through the Panama Canal into the Pacific, simply as an object lesson to the American people of the military value of this canal, and anchor in San Francisco Bay, upon whose expansive waters might ride the fleets of all the nations. [Applause.]

Unless this exposition is located on the Pacific coast much of the historical significance of it will be lost. Columbus and the great explorers of the past sought the northwest passage to the Indies. This cutting of the narrow isthmus provides that passage. It is the opening up of the Atlantic into the Pacific. We are on the point of realizing the prophecy of William H. Seward, made more than 50 years ago in the Senate, that the Pacific Ocean, its shores and its islands and the great region beyond, would some day be the chief theater of events in the world's hereafter. The past century has marked the tremendous commercial development of the Atlantic, but the present century will mark the wonderful development of commerce in the Pacific.

Our interests are many in the Pacific Ocean—the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines. American influence is dominant there. Every consideration demands that we should hold that exposition upon the western shore.

Our great expositions in the past have been along the line westward, marking the trail of civilization—Philadelphia in 1876, Chicago in 1893, and St. Louis in 1904.

Westward the star of empire takes its way. Let this country keep step with the march of progress. Let us have an exposition on the Pacific coast of such power and grandeur as the indomitable American spirit of the people there alone can make; that will cause not only the Occident, but the Orient, to wonder at the marvelous resources, the power, and the influence of the American Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for San Francisco as the most desirable place in which to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal. The completion of the great canal will be the consummation of the hopes of all the great world builders and the realization of the constructive dreamers of four centuries. It will mark the engineering triumph of all the ages. It will divide the continents, connect the oceans, extend our coast line, and make us invulnerable on land and sea. We should fittingly celebrate the completion of this gigantic undertaking. The Panama Canal is ours. We have built it, we will own it, and we will protect it forever. We want a Panama year, and 1915 is written as the time and San Francisco as the place in our glorious coming annals.

Sir, in the interest of all the people I have carefully considered where in all America is the best place in which to hold this

celebration and have come to the irresistible conclusion that the only suitable place to do justice to the Panama Exposition is the beautiful city of San Francisco. There are many reasons for this judgment. In the short time allowed to me for discussion I can not go into all of them, but one reason is enough, and that is the opening in 1915 of the Panama Canal will extend the coast line of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The stupendous work is essentially a Pacific project, and the commercial metropolis of the Pacific Ocean is beyond question San Francisco—the city of boundless hospitality, the city of warm hearts and glad hands, the greatest cosmopolitan city on all the broad Pacific. She needs no eulogy. Her story is the pride of America.

All credit to the intrepid citizens of San Francisco. They know no such word as fail. All glory to the new San Francisco. She has risen phoenix-like from her ashes—greater and grander than ever—the wonder of the world. The people of San Francisco are determined to demonstrate to all the world the progress they are achieving in everything that makes for the advancement of humanity. They ask the Government for no help. They want no gift. They appeal for no loan. All they ask is that the Government recognize the importance of their celebration of the opening of the Panama Canal, lend its official indorsement, take part in it, build its own buildings, makes its own exhibits, do so at its own expense, officially invite the other nations to do likewise—and San Francisco will do the rest.

The Government has aided financially every exposition of a national character ever held in this country. No Government aid is asked by San Francisco for this Panama Exposition—not a dollar is sought, directly or indirectly—only suitable recognition and the extension of an official invitation to all the world to come, to see, and to participate.

The San Francisco Exposition will be in the interest of all the people. It will materially benefit all sections of our country. In an educational way it will be a blessing to all the world. Then why should the Government refuse the request of San Francisco? I can not believe that we shall be so blind to our own best interests as to permit this legislation to fail. Congress should lend a friendly recognition to the enterprising and progressive people on our Pacific borders. They are entitled to it. They are doing a great work, that benefits all the people of our country. This exposition will bring to the attention of the world the wonderful natural resources and the great commercial possibilities of the countries bordering on the Pacific, and do much to strengthen the friendly trade relations of the nations on the ocean of the Orient.

Mr. Speaker, I am a friend of San Francisco. All things considered, she deserves the honor of the Panama Exposition. Select as the celebration city the beautiful metropolis of the Pacific coast and it will be for the good of all. The Panama exposition will be a memorable milestone, marking a great epoch in our onward and upward progress. It will diffuse knowledge, educate the people, and exhibit the wonderful resources of our country and the constructive genius of our people. It will mean ocular demonstration, a great object lesson along historical, and educational, and mechanical, and commercial lines. It will mean triumph and advancement and enlightenment—and all for humanity. It will emphasize our greatness and our grandeur and our glory. It will illustrate our marvelous growth in every line of human effort, and demonstrate the giant strides our citizens are making along every avenue of industrial progress. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, the completion of the Panama Canal will be an event of great importance and significance, and its fitting celebration is a matter of deep interest and concern to all the people of the United States and of the world.

Two candidates for the celebration appear in the person of New Orleans and San Francisco, and many reasons have been advanced in support of each. I am in favor of holding the celebration at San Francisco, not, as some have said, because it was recently destroyed by fire and earthquake and was rebuilt by the indomitable will and enterprise of its citizens. Some similar reasons have been urged in favor of New Orleans—that it, too, had its calamities by flood, war, and pestilence and rose from its adversities by the fortitude, courage, and enterprise of its people. However much such reasons may awake our sympathy and admiration, they are in reality no reasons whatever, for this exposition is not a consolation prize or a solace to be given to compensate for past trials or tribulations, however grievous they may have been, but is an event that should serve to impress and instruct our people in industrial arts and sciences and instill in them patriotic pride in this great achievement, the result of our common effort and common labor. This being true, the question of location is one that must be determined

by the interests of the majority of the people. The time of the year in which people visit expositions is the summer, when they take their vacation, and when the parents as well as the students and school children of the land have their vacation.

That season of the year is not one that invites people to New Orleans or the State of Louisiana. They go to the North and to the mountains for the cool breezes and crystal lakes and sparkling streams. A trip to the Pacific coast, through the Northern States—Washington, Oregon, and California—would be an education and a delight.

Such a trip should be taken by every one of our people that can possibly afford it, and the exposition will be a means of reducing the cost of such a trip so as to bring it within the reach of many who could not otherwise go.

San Francisco and California have offered to give this celebration and to entertain the people of the world without cost to the Federal Government.

They have raised seventeen and a half millions of dollars for the purpose and satisfied the most critical that the affair will be made a great success. Under the circumstances, I believe it wise to give it to them. I believe it will be a success and a fitting commemoration of the great event—the completion of the Panama Canal—the marriage of two great oceans of the world, the greatest achievement of man in the cause of peace and progress in civilization. I favor San Francisco because it is the proper place for the exposition and because its people have demonstrated their ability to make it a success.

In conclusion, I desire to add the following excerpts from the report of the six minority members of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, of which I have the honor to be a member:

PROXIMITY TO THE CANAL.

We do not agree with the majority that because New Orleans is nearer to the Panama Canal than San Francisco the former should be designated as the exposition city. It is not the canal that is to be exhibited to the people of America and the world. The exposition is to be given in celebration of the opening of a new ocean highway, and that event is to be commemorated by an exhibition of the resources of America, their development, and the progress of civilization in the world. The proposed exposition is to be what its name implies, and not merely an opportunity to look upon the canal itself. It is not a question of proximity to the canal at all, but simply a question as to where the exhibition of the wealth of America and the world can be more appropriately held. Besides, we are warranted in believing that more people will see the canal if the exposition is held in San Francisco than will if it be held at New Orleans, for undoubtedly a very large number of people who go to San Francisco will take occasion to pass through the canal going or returning.

LATIN-AMERICAN TRADE.

The majority of the committee have laid special stress upon the trade of Central and South America, and they seem to feel that if the exposition be held at New Orleans it will be the means of stimulating this trade. We do not wish to minimize the importance of encouraging and fostering our trade with the Latin-American Republics, but we do feel that undue emphasis is being placed upon this point as compared with the importance of stimulating and increasing our trade with the other sections of the world, and especially the trade of the Orient. The Middle West and the Atlantic seaboard have always enjoyed opportunities to cultivate commercial intercourse with the Atlantic side of Central and South America, and the opening of the Panama Canal will not alter these conditions. The combined trade of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Venezuela in 1909 was \$1,301,123,000, and that upon the Pacific side of South America was \$345,000,000. The bulk of South American trade, therefore, so far as the Mississippi Basin and the Atlantic seaboard are concerned, will not be affected by the opening of the canal, but the completion of the canal will permit the west coast of our country to cultivate and enjoy a much larger portion of that trade.

ORIENTAL TRADE.

In recent years the commerce of the Orient has attracted world-wide attention, and all trade-seeking nations are exerting every effort to obtain a greater share of that commerce. America ought to occupy first place in the trade with Asia. In 1909 the trade between Japan and America amounted to \$97,000,000; the entire world trade of Japan was \$415,000,000. In 1909 our trade with China amounted to \$48,000,000 out of a combined world trade of China amounting to \$432,000,000. The manufacturers and producers of America are looking to Asia for new markets to absorb our surplus products, and through our State Department commercial agents are being sent throughout Asia to enlarge our trade and commerce. Our trade with Europe and with the Latin Republics of the south will increase along natural and settled lines, but the great field for exploitation lies in the Orient, and we can not afford to permit any opportunity to pass by that will strengthen our position in those great opening markets. At San Francisco, America and Asia can with the greatest ease and facility, exhibit articles intended for exchange, thereby stimulating the trade between the two countries and at the same time further cement the ties of cordial friendship between America and the nations of the Far East.

A naval display in which all the navies of the world may be reviewed should occupy a prominent place in the celebration of the opening of the canal, and San Francisco in a conspicuous degree, with her splendid harbor, affords the opportunity for a magnificent naval and maritime spectacle.

In addition to the foregoing reasons why the exposition should be held at San Francisco, we feel that a trip to the Pacific coast will be of immense educational value to the people of our country. Assurances have been made that a great reduction will be made in the railway fares and that opportunity will be given for going and returning by different routes. Tens of thousands of our people will find in the exposition a justifiable inducement to make it a journey of continuous sight-

seeing, and while upon the Pacific coast will be afforded rare opportunities of beholding the wonders of the West, its almost inexhaustible resources, and its boundless opportunities for development. Such a trip will be an exposition in itself and will be as profitable as a visit to the exposition grounds, where the products of the genius and skill of the earth will be displayed before their eyes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts reserve his time?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The original 20 minutes has expired.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I reserve the balance of the time.

Mr. RODENBERG. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I desire to say at the outset of my remarks that owing to the short time allotted for debate it will be impossible for me to permit any interruptions, as I shall consume a full half hour in the presentation of my argument.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions asks the House not to select for consideration House joint resolution 213, introduced by Mr. KAHN, but to consider H. R. 29362, introduced by Mr. ESTOPINAL. We base our request upon the fact that under the provisions of paragraph 60 of Rule XI, defining the powers and duties of committees, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions unquestionably has primary jurisdiction over all bills relating to proposed expositions. The committee was created for that express purpose and has no other functions, and since its creation in the Fifty-sixth Congress it has considered and reported every exposition bill that has been brought to the attention of this House. It considered and reported the bill for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, the Lewis and Clark Exposition at Portland, the Ter-Centennial Exposition at Jamestown, the Alaska-Yukon Exposition at Seattle, and the bill providing for our Government's participation in the International Exposition to be held at Tokyo, Japan, in 1917. This is the first time since the committee was created that an attempt has ever been made by any Member, by indirection and subterfuge, to take from this committee, which is one of the regularly constituted committees of the House, the jurisdiction to which it is clearly entitled under the rules.

In order that the House may have a clear understanding of this question of jurisdiction, I shall make a brief statement giving the history of this proposed legislation. In December, 1909, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] introduced a bill in the House providing for holding an exposition in San Francisco in 1915 to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal, and asking for a donation of \$5,000,000 from Congress for that purpose.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and while it was still pending before that committee, and before any action had even been requested by the gentleman from California, on May 8, 1910, he introduced House joint resolution 213, authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco, Cal., in 1915, and he had that resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is possible, of course, because of the adroit wording of the resolution, that it was properly referred to that committee, but I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this very provision authorizing the President to invite foreign nations to participate in this proposed exposition at San Francisco was incorporated in and a part of the bill introduced by the gentleman in December, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions and which was pending there at the time of the introduction of his joint resolution. Of course it is not for me to question the mental processes that impelled the gentleman to try to secure action on the same matter from two committees at the same time. It is not for me to question the motives that prompted this short cut across lots to possible success. I might say in passing, however, that it was generally understood in this House that consideration of the exposition matter would go over until this short session of Congress, and it was also generally understood that the city of New Orleans intended to compete for the honor of being designated as the exposition city. Far be it from me, however, to even intimate that there was the slightest connection between the "snap judgment" joint resolution of May, 1910, and the fact that New Orleans had signified her intention of introducing an exposition bill at the short session of Congress.

Now, on December 14, 1910, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ESTOPINAL, introduced his bill, H. R. 29362, and that bill was referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions. Just prior to the holiday adjournment, and not until then, the gentleman from California attempted to withdraw his bill, and asked unanimous consent that the Committee on

Industrial Arts and Expositions be discharged from its further consideration, but the consent of the House was not obtained. When Congress reconvened this month, as chairman of the committee I notified both Mr. KAHN and Mr. ESTOPINAL that the committee would begin hearings on their respective bills on January 10 and invited them to be present. On the appointed day both gentlemen, accompanied by several hundred friends, appeared before the committee. Mr. KAHN having introduced the first bill, was granted the floor, and he then and there informed the committee that San Francisco desired no hearing upon his bill, and he asked that it might die upon the files of the committee. The floor was then granted to New Orleans, and three days were consumed by the friends of that city in presenting their case. When they had concluded, San Francisco asked to be heard in opposition to the bill and in advocacy of their city. The committee granted the request, and for three additional days we were deluged with a flood of impassioned oratory. The gentleman from California, Mr. KAHN, himself consumed two hours in the presentation of his argument. Every possible courtesy was extended by the committee to both sides and no limitation was placed upon the length of the hearings.

I felt, and I know the members of the committee felt, that the action of the gentleman from California in consuming three days of the committee's time clearly indicated that he was prepared to concede the jurisdiction of our committee in reporting to the House on this proposed exposition. In fact, when the committee went into session for final action on the bill one of the members, who has been a consistent friend of San Francisco from the beginning, introduced a substitute for the Estopinal bill, which he said embodied the ideas of the San Francisco people with reference to an exposition, and which, if adopted, would be entirely acceptable to them. It was only after the substitute was defeated and the Estopinal bill was favorably reported by a vote of 9 to 6 that the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions was again ignored, and the gentleman from California decided to stand pat on his "snap judgment" joint resolution. [Applause.]

In view of these facts, gentlemen of the House, I ask you not to consider the joint resolution, but, as a matter of parliamentary decency, in the interest of orderly procedure, and as a matter of justice to a committee of this House that has tried to do its duty faithfully, intelligently, and impartially, to consider the bill that we have reported to you for your approval. [Applause.] So much for the parliamentary situation. We do not, however, rest our case on that alone. We go further. We ask you to consider the merits of the Estopinal bill and the demerits of the Kahn resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well said by one of the speakers that the year 1915 is destined to mark an epoch in the world's history. In that year the greatest engineering feat known to civilization and one that forever establishes American supremacy in the domain of scientific achievement will be an accomplished fact. In that year the Panama Canal, linking together the two great oceans, will be opened to the commerce of the world, and the prestige of the United States, to which alone belongs the imperishable glory of carrying to a successful conclusion this greatest of all modern undertakings, will be advanced far beyond the dreams of prophecy.

Unless I greatly underestimate the patriotic spirit of the American people, unless I wholly misinterpret their feeling of national pride, I believe there is a decided sentiment throughout the length and breadth of the Republic in favor of a great national celebration commemorative of this most important event in our history. I believe that every American citizen feels that no event in our history since the signing of the Declaration of Independence is more worthy of commemoration than the opening of the Panama Canal. That great work will forever stand as the very acme of constructive genius, the epitome of engineering skill. No national undertaking has ever aroused such universal interest or has ever so completely centered upon itself the sympathetic attention of all mankind.

I believe that Congress would be derelict in its duty to the public did we not pass a bill providing for the celebration of this event in keeping with the dignity and the greatness of the Republic. I believe that the people are intensely interested in the kind and character of celebration that is to be held, and I do not believe that they will be satisfied with a celebration that is to be entirely local in its nature and that is wholly under the control of a State or municipality, no matter how progressive, how enterprising, or how hospitable the people of that State or municipality may be. [Applause.]

A great national event of this kind calls for a national celebration, under national supervision and under national control. The people of the Atlantic coast and of the Mississippi

Valley have just as vital an interest in its success as have the people of San Francisco and the Pacific coast. The United States and not the city of San Francisco should act as host to the nations of the earth, and every guest who accepts our invitation, be he English, French, German—yes, or Japanese—should be made to feel that the Government of the United States will accord to each and every one exactly the same kind of treatment and exactly the same measure of protection. [Applause.] Nothing short of this guaranty will satisfy them or should satisfy us, and this guaranty can only be maintained by placing the proposed exposition under Federal control. We can not afford as a nation to run even the slightest risk of offending any friendly power by reason of any act of omission or commission, intentional or unintentional, on the part of any State or municipality in this Union. If foreign nations are to be invited to participate in an exposition on American soil, the Government itself, as a matter of prudence and precaution and in strict justice to itself, must have full power and authority to prescribe all rules and regulations governing their treatment while in the United States. Any other course is sure to lead to endless trouble, and might even result in severing the friendly ties that now bind us to them. [Applause.]

In the judgment of a majority of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions the Estopinal bill embodies the public conception of the kind of an exposition that should be held to commemorate the opening of the canal. The distinctive feature of this bill is to be found in the fact that it provides for the appointment of a nonpartisan commission by the President of the United States, and this commission is given full and complete supervisory control over the exposition. I might add, in passing, that the salary and expenses of the commission, its secretary and clerical force, shall be paid by the exposition company.

The gentleman from California, on the other hand, has no bill pending before this House which he desires to have considered defining the character and scope of the exposition which San Francisco proposes to hold. All that we know about their intentions since the attempted withdrawal of his bill is the vague and indefinite information contained in this joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign nations to participate in their exposition. In fact, the gentlemen who represented San Francisco at the hearings stated distinctly, emphatically, and repeatedly that they did not ask or expect the participation of the United States in their exposition. They said that they did not even want a Government exhibit, and they announced with emphasis and as a finality that at no future time would they ask Congress to pass any legislation of this kind in their behalf. In the literature with which they have flooded Congress they make the positive and unequivocal declaration that their exposition is to be wholly under local control. In his resolution the gentleman simply asks the President to invite foreign nations to make exhibits here, and in the same breath we are informed that they do not desire to have the Government itself make an exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, this proposition is certainly a novel one. It would be positively amusing were it not absolutely absurd. Mr. Speaker, whenever you invite me to dine at your home I have a right to expect you to occupy a seat at the table, and if you should deliberately and willfully absent yourself I would be justified in construing your conduct as an intentional insult, and if I had advance information of your intention not to perform the duties of a host after inviting me to be your guest my reply to your invitation would have to be printed on asbestos to insure its transmission through the mails. [Applause.]

I use temperate language when I make the statement that an invitation extended to foreign powers under the conditions that are to obtain at San Francisco is little less than a deliberate insult, and I make the prediction that if this resolution is adopted the San Francisco exposition will be the most colossal failure of the age so far as foreign exhibits are concerned. [Applause.] No; gentlemen, not only do I believe that the Government of the United States should have its own exhibit at the exposition, but that it should have the largest, the best, and the most comprehensive exhibit of any nation that participates. [Applause.] I do not believe in Congress appropriating money in the shape of a loan or donation in aid of an exposition, but I do believe in an appropriation for a dignified and decent Government exhibit. The Estopinal bill carries no appropriation for a loan or donation, but it does authorize an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for Government buildings and exhibit. That authorization is not in the least excessive. Why, a few years ago, in the midst of the famous filibuster in this House, Congress unanimously passed a bill, which I had the honor to

report to the House, appropriating one and one-half million dollars to pay for our exhibit at the international exposition to be held at Tokyo, Japan, in 1917. If we can afford to appropriate one and one-half million dollars to celebrate some event in Japanese history we certainly can afford an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for our own exhibit at our own exposition to commemorate the greatest event in our own history.

Gentlemen of the House, I hope you will not forget that in voting for the New Orleans bill you are voting for a dignified exposition under Government supervision and under Government control, and in voting for San Francisco you are voting in effect for a State fair, grand, magnificent, backed by untold millions, but a State fair nevertheless. [Applause.] One would typify the dignity and the power of the Federal Government; the other would typify the energy and enterprise of an ambitious American city.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are still other strong and convincing reasons, both of a practical and sentimental nature, why New Orleans should be selected as the exposition site. In the first place, New Orleans is the nearest city in the United States to the canal. It is distant only 1,300 miles, while San Francisco is distant 3,500 miles, or almost three times as far away. The success of any exposition depends, in a large measure, upon the cheapness and the rapidity of the transportation, and viewed from this important standpoint New Orleans has every possible advantage over San Francisco. I make the bold assertion that there is not a citizen living east of the Mississippi River—yes, I will go further, and say that there is not a citizen east of Omaha—who would not be able to go to New Orleans and from there to Panama and return for less money than it would cost him to go from his home to San Francisco and return. [Applause.] The general manager of the United Fruit Steamship Lines, plying between New Orleans and Colon, informed us at the hearings that it was the purpose of his company to make a \$40 round-trip rate from New Orleans to Panama during the exposition period on 18-knot steamers that will make the trip one way in three days.

Our friends from San Francisco have laid great stress upon the statement that the people of the United States have been surfeited with expositions, and that they are heartily sick and tired of them all. It is barely possible that our friends are right in their analysis of public sentiment; but if so, I maintain that they themselves have advanced a splendid argument in favor of the selection of New Orleans. If it be true that the public is no longer interested in expositions, then let us try the experiment of making the exposition simply an incident of a visit to the Panama Canal itself, the thing to be celebrated, and whose completion every American citizen believes in celebrating.

You can not do that by locating the exposition at San Francisco, but you can do it if you locate the exposition at New Orleans. Let us give the people an opportunity to visit the canal itself, on which the Government will have expended when completed over \$400,000,000. [Applause.] The average American citizen who is in the habit of taking a vacation can not afford to spend more than \$100 during the time that he absents himself from his regular employment. If he were given his choice of spending this money for a trip to San Francisco, with the monotony of four or five days' confinement in a stuffy sleeper, or spending it for a trip to the historic city of New Orleans, and from there to Panama, with an ocean voyage of six or seven days, giving him, perhaps for the first time, an opportunity to see an alien people, and above all enabling him to personally inspect this wonderful feat of engineering, which has been so thoroughly exploited in all of the magazines and newspapers of the country, my judgment is that 99 out of every 100 would decide in favor of the southern trip. [Applause.] A visit to California would, of course, be highly interesting, but a visit to New Orleans and Panama would be highly instructive as well, whether that visit were made in the month of January or in the month of July.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 200,000,000 people on the Western Hemisphere. To-day the doctrine first enunciated by President Monroe that any attempt on the part of a foreign nation to gain a foothold on American soil would be construed by the United States as an unfriendly act is, for all practical purposes, recognized as a principle of international law. In effect, we have established a protectorate over the countries of the New World, and on several occasions we have enforced a strict observance of the underlying principle of the Monroe doctrine. The people of the countries lying to the south of us have come to look upon that doctrine as the sheet anchor of their territorial sovereignty. They have come to look upon the United States as their natural ally and friend, and they are more than anxious to enter into closer commercial relations with us.

A few years ago the distinguished gentleman who was then Secretary of State [Mr. Root] made a tour of the Latin-American Republics, and prepared the way for an increase in our trade with those countries. The foreign trade of Central and South America reaches the enormous total of \$2,000,000,000 annually, or almost twice as much as that of the Orient, and the United States to-day enjoys less than 10 per cent of that total. This is due to our own neglect, our own failure to improve our opportunities. It is high time for us to change our policy and to give attention to the development of our trade in this rich and prolific field. The city of New Orleans is the natural gateway for the countries to the south of us, the logical distributing point for our products and our manufactures. I believe that if this exposition is located in New Orleans the countries of Central and South America, whose trade is of such transcendent importance, will have exhibits there that will completely overshadow those of Europe and the Orient. [Applause.] Already we have received an intimation that the Republic of Brazil alone is prepared to expend from one to one and a half millions of dollars on her exhibit. And I predict that as a result of those exhibits in a city that has two-thirds of all the American trade of Central and South America, that trade will be stimulated as never before, and the manufacturers and producers of the United States will be benefited more than they have ever been benefited by any exposition held on American soil.

Something has been said by my colleague [Mr. Foss] in reference to the financial ability of New Orleans to conduct a creditable exposition. Reference has also been made to the failure of the exposition held in New Orleans in 1885.

Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans of 1885 is not the New Orleans of 1910. [Applause.] Then she lay prostrate, "bleeding at every pore," ravished by flood and by fever. But a quarter of a century has intervened since then, a quarter of a century of American civilization, with all its hopes, with all of its possibilities for material development.

Touched by the magic wand of prosperity, she has been aroused from her slumbers and to-day stands forth full of life and vigor, a modern, progressive, and thoroughly American city. [Applause.] The people of the State of Louisiana, by an overwhelming vote, have adopted constitutional amendments providing for a bond issue of six and one-half million dollars in support of this exposition. The public-spirited citizens of New Orleans have already subscribed approximately \$2,000,000 more, and every subscription has been paid in the form of a bankable note. It is confidently believed that they will be able to raise at least one and one-half million dollars more by popular subscription, making a grand total of \$10,000,000, in support of the exposition. With \$10,000,000 available, who will say that New Orleans is not prepared to conduct a successful exposition and to demonstrate to the world that the new South is an actual living, breathing reality? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODENBERG. I think I have four minutes yet.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RODENBERG. May I ask the indulgence of the House for two minutes more?

Mr. FASSETT. I hope no objection will be made.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Four minutes!

The SPEAKER. What is the request—two minutes or four minutes?

Mr. RODENBERG. Two minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODENBERG. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to advance still another reason why New Orleans should be selected, a reason that is wholly sentimental, but which should appeal to every American citizen who cherishes the sacred memories of the past.

Mr. Speaker, we love to talk about a reunited country. We love to feel that sectionalism has disappeared, and so it has, and that every citizen is devoted to that flag whose Stars and Stripes have been baptized in the best blood of American patriotism. [Applause.] On the 9th day of April, 1915, will occur the fiftieth anniversary of Appomattox. On that historic day, so full of tender and tragic memories, it is proposed to hold a grand reunion in the city of New Orleans of those who wore the colors that suggest the gray of the morning sky and the blue of full noon, and standing there, 'mid the scenes of long ago, under the folds of the Nation's flag, with hands clasped and hearts overflowing, these grand old heroes of ours will bury forever the last vestige of bitterness growing out of that great conflict. [Long and loud applause.] A sentiment? Yes; a sentiment that should strike a responsive chord in every patriotic American heart, a sentiment whose dramatic fulfillment at

New Orleans in 1915 will challenge the lasting admiration of the world. [Long, loud, and continued applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, I represent the district just across the magnificent Bay of San Francisco, in which is located the county of Alameda, whose people are imbued with that splendid California spirit which prompted them to forward the message which I will read and which furnishes but another evidence of California's ability to finance this great exposition:

OAKLAND, CAL., January 18, 1911.

Hon. J. R. KNOWLAND, Washington D. C.:

At the annual meeting of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, which has a membership of 1,700, representing a community of more than a quarter of a million in this county on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay, we pledge through you to our sister city our most loyal support and cooperation, and stand ready to support a million-dollar bond issue by Alameda County, if required, in addition to the amount already subscribed.

W. S. MACKAY, President.
A. A. DENISON, Secretary.

Within the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan district, according to the latest census reports, there is a population of 654,466, while the New Orleans metropolitan district contains a population of but 375,123. Transportation companies have demonstrated the fact as the result of their experience at past expositions that 80 per cent of the attendance comes from within a distance of 250 miles. Within 250 miles of San Francisco are over 1,400,000 people, while within the same distance from New Orleans there is less than half this number. The people within the 250-mile radius of San Francisco are pleasure-loving, money-spending people, who will attend an exposition.

Our friends from New Orleans are exhibiting a map in the lobby of the House showing how far San Francisco is removed from the centers of population. This same argument and similar maps no doubt were used to secure votes in Congress for the International Cotton Exposition, held in the city of New Orleans in 1884-85, and for the Jamestown Exposition, held in 1907. Proximity to the centers of population does not force people to attend expositions. They prefer to go where there is something to see in addition to the exposition. This fact is clearly demonstrated by an examination of the figures of attendance at the New Orleans, Jamestown, Seattle, and Portland expositions. The New Orleans exposition held in 1884 was open 170 days, and the total paid attendance was but 1,158,840. The total paid attendance at the Jamestown Exposition, held in 1907, was but 1,401,000. The paid attendance at the Seattle Exposition, held at Seattle, Wash., in 1909, was 2,766,000, and this exposition was open a less number of days than either the New Orleans or Jamestown expositions. These figures show that the attendance at the Seattle Exposition, which was not a Government exposition, as were the two Southern expositions, was greater than the paid attendance of the two Southern expositions combined. The city of Portland, Oreg., in 1905, held an exposition, and the paid attendance was 1,589,000, which was larger than at either New Orleans or Jamestown, and the Portland Exposition was open a less number of days. This is the most convincing answer to the argument of proximity to population centers. Californians entertain no fears that the people will fail to attend the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Seeking no Government assistance, able and anxious to finance the exposition, we ask simply that the President, through Congress, extend an invitation to foreign nations to participate in the celebration of a most memorable event—the completion of the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, whatever be the result of these deliberations, whether the exposition be held in 1915 in San Francisco or in New Orleans, but few people of this country will plan a trip or vacation solely to visit the exposition. This will be only one of the incidents. When do people take a vacation? In the summer time, of course; and who in his sane senses would plan to take any part of his summer vacation in the city of New Orleans? Yet this is the only time when an exposition of this kind can be held and made a success. It is in the summer time that the schools are not in session, and the young people who are attending colleges and schools can visit an exposition; when business men can shake off for a little time the cares of their business and go somewhere and take a little vacation and rest, and incidentally attend the exposition. So I say—and this is not meant to reflect upon the people of New Orleans nor upon that city—that geographically New Orleans is so situated and other conditions are such that our southern neighbor at no time in the year could make a success of an exposition. An exposition would be as great a failure in 1915 as it was in 1884-85.

The incidents to which men look when they consider where they are to go on a vacation are the things that ought to control in this matter. Think of the things that men off on a vacation may see on the way to California and in California. They can visit the Garden of the Gods; they can go over the Great Divide by Marshall Pass and the Grand Canyon of the Arkansas; and they may see the great Salt Lake and its surroundings, including Salt Lake City and the beautiful Wasatch Mountains. They can see the Sierra Nevada Mountains; they can take in, if they choose, the Yellowstone National Park, the beautiful Cascade Mountains, The Dalles and Cascades of the Columbia River, and the Puget Sound country. Without leaving their seats in the train they may in passing get many grand and inspiring views of those grandest of mountains, Rainier, Hood, and Shasta, at the very feet of which the train passes. They may view that wonder of nature, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, more than 1 mile deep. Once in California, there is the Yosemite Valley, the big trees, the everblooming flowers, the delicious fruits, and everything to bring delight to the senses and comfort to mind and body. To see these things when no exposition is in progress men make long journeys from all over the world. What will they do in 1915? A very large percentage of the population of this country will go and see these wonders for themselves. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCKINLAY of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in behalf of the city of San Francisco from the standpoint of locality. I desire to do this because a great deal has been said, both before the Committees of Industrial Arts and Foreign Relations and in this House, as to which city of the two, New Orleans or San Francisco, is the most logical point at which to hold the international fair of 1915.

Now, the fact is that the center of the United States longitudinally is just about 200 miles westward from the Golden Gate in the Pacific Ocean. [Applause.] This is absolutely true. So when you take into consideration the space between the eastern and western points of our Nation, San Francisco will be found to be nearer the center than any other city over which our flag flies.

As has been well said in this debate, the opening of the Pacific Ocean, with all its potentialities and possibilities, has been the object of the entire canal scheme from the days of Columbus to the present hour. Columbus sailed westward from Spain not with the idea or the hope of discovering new continents or strange islands; his voyage of discovery was merely to find a shorter route to Asia and the East India Islands than that which the navigators of the world up to that time had followed, around the Cape of Good Hope.

The completion of the Panama Canal will be really the opening of the gateway of the Pacific Ocean to new routes of ocean travel. It will be the culmination of the efforts of Columbus and the realization of the hopes and dreams of the world's navigators and geographers since his time, and this significant event would most properly be celebrated in that city of America which is most prominently situated on the great western sea, whose waters wash the shores of the coasts and islands of nearly all Asiatic lands, and that city is, without question, the city of San Francisco.

In the year 1800 Baron von Humboldt, the celebrated German explorer, while prosecuting his explorations and surveys up and down the coasts and countries of Central America, in writing to his friend Goethe, the German poet, foretold the linking of the two great oceans of the world together at some future time by an artificial waterway. Von Humboldt foresaw that in time this would become a necessity in order to facilitate ocean transportation and improve the methods of distributing the goods and commodities of the various nations of the world by international commerce, and in this connection he said "that in his opinion the new Republic to the north, the United States of America, even then rapidly springing into the world's notice as a world power, would be the nation that would accomplish the work of uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific," and now, after over a century, the prophecy of Humboldt is being fulfilled and the culmination of four centuries of effort is in sight.

Secretary of State Seward, in 1867, when he purchased Alaska from Russia for the sum of \$7,200,000, was the object of scorn and derision both in his own country and abroad. He was accused of having squandered the people's money in the acquisition of an iceberg and a fog bank; but Seward was wiser than his critics, and answered that even within the lives of men then living the Pacific Ocean would become the greatest theater of the world's trade and commerce; that Asia would awaken from her slumber of many centuries and hordes of people would learn to understand the advantages and possibilities of occidental civilization, and would become factors in the world's govern-

ment and development. He foretold that the seats of power of the greatest nations in the world would some day become located on the border of the Pacific, and the fulfillment of the prophecy of Seward gives ample justification of his statesmanship when, in spite of adverse criticism, he made the Alaskan purchase. That hour is at hand. Within the last two decades the United States, by a series of fortuitous events, has been placed in a position of control and authority over the Pacific Ocean. Her influence over Asiatic countries is greater than that of any other power in the world.

Since the opening of Japan by Perry it has been the policy of our Government to treat the peoples of Asia with tolerance, consideration, and respect. We have refrained from spoliation and the exploitation of their lands. We have to-day, despite the irritation and friction existing on the Pacific coast arising from the desire of the people of that section of the Republic to exclude Asiatic labor, without question the confidence and the friendship of the rulers and the Governments of the nations of Asia.

President Taft is better acquainted with Asiatic conditions and possibilities than perhaps any living American. His long experience in the Philippine Islands, his passing to and fro on his various journeys through China, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and Siberia has given him knowledge and understanding as to the advantages that can be secured for America by developing the spirit of international comity and good will between the Asiatic lands and our own.

For the future industrial success and development of America markets for the products of the shops, mills, farms, forests, factories, and forges of our land are most necessary. Already our tremendous industrial system is turning out more goods than can be consumed at home, and, in order that labor shall continue its employment in the future, it is absolutely necessary that we reach out as quickly as possible and secure our share of the world's trade. President Taft knows this and is making this work one of the prominent features of his splendid administration. We can not hope to materially increase our trade in Europe, as every European nation is a competitor.

We can not at present hope for very much increase from South America, as the entire population of that part of the world is less than 40,000,000 of people, and already every South American country is filled with the agents of European manufacturers and exporters in search of markets for European goods, and 12 steamship lines traverse the seas from the eastern coast of South America to the various European ports, while there is not a single American steamship line in regular commission between the United States and South America.

We are barred in a measure because of these unfortunate conditions from South American markets and will be until we establish steamship lines of our own to carry our goods to the southern republics. But over in Asia we find almost an entirely new and comparatively unoccupied field, and therefore President Taft in his wisdom is directing the efforts of the State Department, with the purpose of securing advantages that can be obtained in no other part of the earth.

It will be of much assistance to him in the development of his foreign policies that this great international fair should be held at San Francisco. Every land of Asia will send its representatives there in far greater numbers and with far greater freedom than they would to any other place, and because of the friendship and familiarity that will grow out of the comingling of our people and the orientals at this exposition, should it be held at San Francisco, lasting results may be secured for the Nation; results and advantages that could not be secured by the location of this fair at any other city of America.

I believe, then, that from this high ground, looking upon this whole subject not from the standpoint of locality or the peculiar necessities of a city or State, or from the ease or cheapness with which our own people could travel to the exposition, but rather looking upon the whole subject from the broad standpoint of nationality and the greatest good to the greatest number of American people; looking upon it from the viewpoint of the assistance it will give President Taft in developing his Asiatic policy, San Francisco should be the choice of the American Congress, and Congress should instruct the President to invite the nations of the world to meet at San Francisco to celebrate the opening of the Panama Canal in 1915. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the question at issue here is whether the bill introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ESTOPINAL] or the resolution introduced by myself shall be considered by this House. The bill of the gentleman from Louisiana inaugurates an exposition by the Government of the

United States, and it is that kind of a bill that heretofore has always enabled a community that made a failure of its exposition to come to the Congress of the United States and ask for financial assistance. We of California do not propose at any time to come to the Congress for a single dollar of appropriation for this exposition. [Applause.] The legislature of our State on the 23d of January last unanimously passed a joint resolution pledging the honor of the people of California never to ask for a single dollar in aid of this international exposition [applause], and the people of California keep their faith. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the real terminals of the Panama Canal are New York on the east and San Francisco on the west. [Applause.] The exposition should be held at that magnificent metropolis at the western end, because the canal itself is being built to bring the people of the West closer to the people of the East. There have been three great international expositions held in the Mississippi Valley region within the last quarter of a century; three great international expositions—one at New Orleans, one at Chicago, and one at St. Louis—that have had national aid to the extent of almost \$14,000,000 in direct appropriations and a loan of \$4,625,000, which was subsequently repaid to the Government. They have had, as I say, in actual cash for three Mississippi Valley expositions nearly \$14,000,000.

The eastern seaboard had its Centennial Exposition in 1876. We of the West have never had a great international exposition. This is the first opportunity we have had to have one, and we are asking the people of the United States simply to let us extend an invitation to the world to exhibit there. We do not ask the people of the United States to tax themselves to the extent of a single cent in aid of this exposition. We will bear all of the burdens.

Talk of sentiment! Why, Mr. Speaker, four years ago I arose on this floor and told the membership of this House of the great calamity that had befallen my city. Your hearts and the hearts of the civilized world went out to us in our great misfortune. Since then, with an energy unparalleled in the history of the world, our people put their shoulders to the wheel, and without asking any favors from any section of the country they rebuilt in the brief period of four years a community that is an everlasting monument to the pluck, the energy, the grit, and the enterprise of all the American people. [Applause.] Why, Mr. Speaker, the people of the entire world are anxious to visit that great western empire, of which our own people in these United States know so little. It is an empire that is capable of supporting millions of people. The great natural wonders can not be excelled in any section of the world. And with the low railroad rates that will prevail during the exposition period hundreds of thousands of visitors will avail themselves of the opportunity to visit the wonderland of the West at a minimum of cost. As has been well said here by my colleague, Mr. HAYES, the people of the world take their vacations in the summer time, and it is in the summer time that California is at her best. It is in the summer that the tourist realizes that it is a land of beauty and of grandeur, where looks the cottage out on a domain the palace can not boast of. The cool breezes from the Pacific are invigorating and exhilarating. Our luscious fruits, our fragrant flowers, and our great natural wonders make glad the heart and delight the eye.

Mr. Speaker, we ask, in behalf of the great and rapidly developing West, that the Members of this House record their votes in favor of that imperial city by the Golden Gate; that city which is beloved around the world; that city that is to-day an inspiration to American manhood; that city which has never yet made a failure of anything she has undertaken; that city of San Francisco that will give the world an exposition of which every American citizen will be more than proud; yes, an exposition that will challenge the admiration of the peoples of the world without asking from the Government of the United States a single dollar to finance or exploit it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the Clerk will call the roll, and those who favor the consideration of the joint resolution naming San Francisco will, as their names are called, answer "San Francisco," and those who favor the consideration of the bill naming New Orleans will, as their names are called, answer "New Orleans." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—for San Francisco 188, for New Orleans 159, for Milwaukee 1, for Washington 1, answered "present" 3, not voting 34, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO—188.

Alexander, N. Y.	Ashbrook	Bates	Burke, Pa.
Allen	Barclay	Bennet, N. Y.	Burke, S. Dak.
Ames	Barnard	Bingham	Butler
Andrus	Barnhart	Boutell	Calder
Anthony	Bartlett, Nev.	Bradley	Calderhead

Cassidy	Greene	Lindbergh	Prince
Cocks, N. Y.	Griest	Loud	Rainey
Cole	Gronna	McCall	Rauch
Conry	Guernsey	McCreary	Reeder
Cooper, Pa.	Hamer	McCredie	Riordan
Cooper, Wis.	Hamilton	McDermott	Roberts
Cox, Ohio	Hammond	McGuire, Okla.	Rucker, Colo.
Creager	Hanna	McKinlay, Cal.	Sabath
Crow	Havens	McKinney	Scott
Crumpacker	Hayley	McLachlan, Cal.	Sheffield
Currier	Hayes	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Dalzell	Henry, Conn.	Madison	Simmons
Davis	Higgins	Mann	Siemp
Dawson	Hill	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Cal.
Diekema	Hinshaw	Martin, S. Dak.	Smith, Iowa
Dodds	Hitchcock	Massey	Smith, Mich.
Draper	Hollingsworth	Maynard	Southwick
Driscoll, M. E.	Howell, Utah	Miller, Kans.	Sperry
Durey	Howland	Miller, Minn.	Stafford
Dwight	Hubbard, Iowa	Mitchell	Steenserson
Ellis	Hughes, N. J.	Mondell	Sterling
Englebright	Humphrey, Wash.	Moon, Pa.	Stevens, Minn.
Esch	Jamieson	Morgan, Mo.	Sullivan
Fassett	Johnson, Ohio	Morrison	Sulzer
Finley	Joyce	Morse	Swasey
Fish	Kahn	Needham	Tawney
Fitzgerald	Kelfer	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Focht	Kelisher	Nicholls	Taylor, Ohio
Foelker	Kendall	Norris	Thomas, Ohio
Fornes	Kennedy, Iowa	Nye	Tilson
Foss	Kennedy, Ohio	O'Connell	Tou Velle
Foster, Vt.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Olcott	Volstead
Fuller	Knapp	Palmer, H. W.	Vreeland
Gallagher	Knowland	Parker	Wanger
Gardner, Mass.	Kopp	Parsons	Washburn
Gardner, Mich.	Kronmiller	Payne	Weeks
Gardner, N. J.	Küstermann	Pearre	Weisse
Garner, Pa.	Lafean	Peters	Wheeler
Gillett	Langham	Plumley	Wiley
Goldfogle	Law	Polindexter	Wilson, Pa.
Goulden	Lawrence	Pratt	Young, Mich.
Grant	Lenroot	Pray	Young, N. Y.

NEW ORLEANS—159.

Adair	Davidson	Houston	Page
Adamson	Dent	Howard	Palmer, A. M.
Aiken	Denver	Hughes, Ga.	Patterson
Alexander, Mo.	Dickinson	Hughes, W. Va.	Pickett
Anderson	Dickson, Miss.	Hull, Tenn.	Pou
Ansberry	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Pujo
Austin	Dixon, Ind.	James	Randell, Tex.
Barchfeld	Douglas	Johnson, Ky.	Ransdell, La.
Bartholdt	Driscoll, D. A.	Johnson, S. C.	Reid
Bartlett, Ga.	Dupre	Jones	Rhinoek
Beall, Tex.	Edwards, Ga.	Kinthead, N. J.	Richardson
Bell, Ga.	Ellerbe	Kitchin	Robinson
Bennett, Ky.	Elvins	Korbly	Roddenbery
Boehne	Estopinal	Lamb	Rodenberg
Booher	Ferris	Langley	Rothermel
Borland	Flood, Va.	Latta	Rucker, Mo.
Bowers	Floyd, Ark.	Legare	Saunders
Brantley	Foster, Ill.	Lever	Shackelford
Broussard	Gaines	Lively	Sims
Burgess	Garner, Tex.	Livingston	Sisson
Burleson	Garrett	Lloyd	Small
Byrd	Gill, Mo.	Longworth	Smith, Tex.
Byrns	Glass	Lundin	Sparkman
Campbell	Godwin	McHenry	Spight
Candler	Good	McKinley, Ill.	Stanley
Cantrill	Gordon	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Carlin	Graff	Madden	Talbot
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Ala.
Chapman	Graham, Pa.	Malby	Thistlewood
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Mays	Thomas, Ky.
Clark, Mo.	Hamlin	Moon, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton	Hardwick	Moore, Tex.	Turnbull
Cline	Hardy	Morehead	Underwood
Collier	Harrison	Morgan, Okla.	Wallace
Covington	Haugen	Moss	Watkins
Cowles	Hay	Moxley	Webb
Cox, Ind.	Helm	Murphy	Wickliffe
Craig	Helm	Oldfield	Wilson, Ill.
Cravens	Henry, Tex.	Olmsted	Woods, Iowa
Cullop	Hobson	Padgett	

MILWAUKEE—1.

Cary

WASHINGTON—1.

Moore, Pa.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Howell, N. J.

Hubbard, W. Va.

Lee

NOT VOTING—34.

Burlleigh	Gill, Md.	Lowden	Snapp
Burnett	Gillespie	McMorran	Sturgiss
Capron	Goebel	Millington	Townsend
Coudrey	Hamill	Mudd	Willett
Denby	Heald	Murdock	Wood, N. J.
Edwards, Ky.	Huff	Sharp	Woodyard
Fairchild	Hull, Iowa	Sheppard	
Fordney	Lindsay	Sherley	
Fowler	Loudenslager	Slayden	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On Panama Exposition question:

Mr. McMORRAN (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. GILLESPIE (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. MURDOCK (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. SHARP (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. FAIRCHILD (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. SLAYDEN (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. LOWDEN (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. SHEPPARD (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. BURNETT (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. WOODYARD (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. HUFF (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. LEE (in favor of New Orleans).

Mr. TOWNSEND (in favor of San Francisco) with Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia (in favor of New Orleans).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The House determines to proceed to the consideration of the following House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915, at San Francisco, Cal.

Resolved, etc. That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the President of the United States that a suitable site has been selected, and that there is an actual bona fide subscription in the sum of not less than \$5,000,000 to the capital stock of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California, for the purpose of inaugurating, carrying forward, and holding an exposition at the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., on or about the 1st day of January, 1915, to celebrate the completion and opening of the Panama Canal, and also the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and respectfully requested, by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper, to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition, with a request that they participate therein.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

In line 5, page 1, strike out all after the words "and that," down to and including the words "stock of" in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following words: "The sum of not less than \$7,500,000 will be available from the citizens of San Francisco and the State of California combined to enable."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Is this bill now read on first reading or is it open to amendment or open to general debate?

The SPEAKER. Replying to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], under the special rule adopted it is open for debate and amendment under the hour rule.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. Am I entitled to the floor for the purpose—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is entitled to an hour.

Mr. KAHN. Exactly so.

The SPEAKER. Really, if application was made, the chairman of the committee from which this bill was reported would be entitled to recognition.

Mr. KAHN. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the committee desires to debate the matter at any length or not.

Mr. MANN. Let us see if we can ascertain, for the convenience of the House, before the Members leave, whether it is expected to take up the time until 4 o'clock with this joint resolution.

Mr. KAHN. There is no disposition on our part to take up any time. We have a few amendments that we would like to offer, and after they have been disposed of we will be prepared to ask for a vote.

Mr. MANN. All right. That will not take long.

Mr. KAHN. Does anybody desire any time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] offers an amendment to a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9 of the committee amendment, after the word "available," strike out the words "from the citizens of San Francisco and the State of California combined."

Mr. HEFLIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the offering of this amendment interfere with the time agreed on by the Committee on Rules—an hour to a side?

The SPEAKER. It is in compliance with the order that has been adopted.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will it deprive those Members—

The SPEAKER. There is no division of time referred to in this special rule adopted by the House. It is now open for consideration under the rules of the House, the only limitation being that at 4 o'clock the previous question shall be ordered upon

the bill and all pending amendments. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] desire a vote on his amendment?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to make the money which is raised by the Panama Pacific Exposition Co. available, no matter what source may have contributed toward the fund. The original amendment of the committee reads:

Money available from the citizens of San Francisco, in the State of California.

Now, a great deal of this money is raised by direct taxation, and, of course, the citizens of San Francisco are not concerned. Some of the taxpayers may not be citizens of California, and we want to avoid any legal complications. Therefore I offered this amendment so as to allow us to raise the money from any source. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8 of committee amendment, after the word "than," strike out "seven million five hundred thousand," and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen million."

Mr. KAHN. That is to raise the amount suggested by the committee. The committee suggested \$7,500,000, and we want to raise it to \$15,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] offers an amendment to the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the joint resolution by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 2. That a commission is hereby constituted, to consist of three commissioners, to be known and designated as the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Commission, who shall be appointed within six months from the passage of this act by the President of the United States, and who shall be subject to removal by him. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments.

"SEC. 3. That the commissioners so appointed shall be called together by the Secretary of State of the United States to meet in the city of San Francisco, by notice to the commissioners, as soon as convenient after their appointment. The commissioners at said first meeting shall organize by the election of their officers, including the election of a secretary, who shall be paid a salary of \$4,000 per annum; and they may then or thereafter appoint such committees as may be deemed expedient. In addition to the salary of the secretary of the commission, there is hereby allowed the sum of \$5,000 per annum, or as much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of defraying the clerical, office, and other necessary expenses of said commission; said salary of the secretary and allowance for clerical, office, and other expenses, including traveling expenses of said commissioners, to be paid by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co., a California corporation.

"SEC. 4. That said commission, when fully organized under the provisions of this act, shall appoint two of their members to act in conjunction with a like number appointed by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. to constitute a board of arbitration, to whom all matters of difference arising between said commission and said company within the jurisdiction and powers of said commission shall be referred for determination; and in case of failure of said board of arbitration to agree on such questions as may be referred, said board of arbitration shall appoint a fifth member thereof; and in the case of failure of said board to agree upon a fifth member, such fifth member shall be appointed by the Secretary of State. Compensation of said temporary arbitrator shall be determined by the commission and paid by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. The decision of said board shall be final in all matters presented to it for consideration and determination.

"SEC. 5. That the allotment of space for exhibitors, classifications of exhibits, the appointment of all juries of awards, and the awarding of premiums shall all be done and performed by the said Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co., subject, however, to the approval of said commission.

"SEC. 6. That after the plans for said exposition shall be prepared by said company, the rules and regulations for said corporation affecting the rights, privileges, or interests of the exhibitors or of the public, shall be fixed and established by said company, subject, however, to the approval of said commission.

"SEC. 7. That the commissioners appointed by the President under the authority of this act shall receive the sum of \$7,500 each per annum and their actual and necessary expenses, including traveling expenses, the same to be paid by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co.

"SEC. 8. That the United States shall not in any manner, under any circumstance, be liable, for any acts or doings or representations of said Panama-Pacific International Exposition or the commission created by this act or under the laws of the State of California, by their officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them, or for services, wages, labor, salaries of said officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them, or for any subscriptions to capital stock or any stock

certificates, bonds, mortgages, or obligations of any kind issued by said corporation, or said commission, or for any debts, liabilities, or expenses of any kind or nature whatever attending such exposition, corporation, or commission, or accruing from the same.

"SEC. 9. That nothing in this act shall be construed as binding the United States Government to extend any pecuniary aid or assistance, either as a loan, donation, or otherwise, to said Panama-Pacific International Exposition, either before or after the termination of said exposition.

"SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to require said Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. to deposit with a depository, to be named by the Secretary of the Treasury, such sum or sums of money as in the discretion of the Secretary shall be necessary to cover awards, medals, certificates, prizes, premiums, and all other obligations incurred by said corporation with exhibitors at said exposition, which moneys shall be held by said depository as a pledge to the United States Government for the faithful fulfillment of the above obligations; or the Secretary of the Treasury may, in lieu of such cash pledge, accept a good and sufficient bond from said exposition company, to be approved by him, and conditioned for the faithful performance of every liability or obligation incurred by said exposition company in respect to exhibitors at said exposition."

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I raise the point of order that the amendment just reported is not germane to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. In what particular is it not germane?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution authorizes the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. It authorizes simply the issuance of an invitation, whereas this amendment creates a commission to perform certain acts, to wit, to control the exhibition, the space, the awards, and to perform sundry other functions not germane to the issuance of an invitation.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I have not the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Do you provide an exhibit by this Government in that amendment?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No, sir.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. You have provided for a commission. Does this Government participate in this exposition?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. We do not provide for any exposition. That is exactly the principle we have been laying down, that the United States Government must not provide for an exposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Minnesota on the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. The resolution proposes to authorize the President of the United States to invite the nations of the world to participate in an exposition to be held in the city of San Francisco. When the Government of the United States, through its President, extends that invitation, and that invitation is accepted, certain obligations rest upon the Government of the United States in respect to the treatment of the nations that accept the invitation to participate in this exposition. The Government of the United States becomes responsible for the manner in which they are to be treated by the exposition company. Now, it therefore follows that this is one of the necessary incidents, to provide for the protection of our invited guests.

The nations that accept that invitation will be the guests of the Government of the United States, and to provide for protecting them while they are on American soil and participating in this exposition is a necessary incident to the invitation. I take it that no gentleman would say that we should invite foreign nations to participate in an exposition and allow the settlement of questions that will arise between the exposition company and the nations respecting their rights in regard to the location of buildings, the allotment of space, the awarding of medals, and the selection of judges to make awards to the exposition company alone. It is not the exposition company that invites them, but the National Government. No Member will contend that we ought to send an invitation to foreign nations under circumstances of that kind without our Government affording them protection while they are here. It does not give the commission any jurisdiction over the local corporation at all, except in so far as it is necessary for the Federal Government to have there a representative to whom foreign exhibitors, exhibiting upon our invitation, may appeal for the protection of their rights and interests.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman this: The question is as to whether this amendment is in order. Is it germane? It is not a question as to the propriety of the Government participating.

Mr. TAWNEY. I suppose that is germane which is a necessary incident to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question of germaneness must be determined from the reading of the resolution and the amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. The point I make, Mr. Speaker, is that this resolution proposes to authorize the President of the United States to invite foreign nations to participate in this exposition. Now, then, to provide for the interests of those nations that accept the invitation while there exhibiting at this exposition seems to be entirely germane to the invitation itself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. On which side of the case is the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. I am in favor of sustaining the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that he is fairly well advised at present. The joint resolution the Chair will read:

Authorizing the President to invite the foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915, at San Francisco, Cal.

By this joint resolution the President is authorized to issue invitations to the nations of the world to participate in an exposition to be held by this exposition company. In substance, that is all there is of it, except the President is to be satisfied that a certain sum is raised, and so forth.

Now, it is not every subject that is related to another subject that is germane. I read from section 779 of the Manual:

Two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related. Thus the following have been held not to be germane: To a proposition relating to the terms of Senators an amendment changing the manner of their election; to a bill relating to commerce between the States an amendment relating to commerce within the several States; to a proposition to relieve destitute citizens of the United States in Cuba, a proposition declaring a state of war in Cuba, and proclaiming neutrality; to a proposition for the appointment of a select committee to investigate a certain subject an amendment proposing an inquiry of the Executive on that subject; to a bill granting a right of way to a railroad an amendment providing for the purchase of the railroad by the Government; to a provision for the erection of a building for a mint an amendment to change the coinage laws.

It seems to the Chair that this amendment is not germane to the joint resolution, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Under the rule, is it in order for a Member of the House to move the previous question prior to the expiration of the time assigned?

The SPEAKER. The special rule under which the House is operating provides that at 4 o'clock p. m. the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and resolution and pending amendments to final passage. In the opinion of the Chair, while the previous question under the ordinary rules of the House might be moved by any Member on the floor, this is a special order adopted by the House, and the Chair thinks that moving the previous question would not be in order prior to 4 o'clock, and then it would not be necessary.

Again, the gentleman from Massachusetts will recognize at once that this order being adopted, gentlemen may have temporarily left the House intending to return at 4 o'clock, and perchance it would not be fair to the membership of the House to give a different construction to the rule.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. One further inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Suppose that after an amendment, which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia, is adopted or rejected, suppose it is found that the House is ready to vote without ordering the previous question, would it not then be in order to vote, or must the House take a recess?

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that in fairness to its membership, under this special order, when the House was exceptionally well represented, for this last session of this Congress, that it would be in order for the House to move a recess, if it had no other business, until 4 o'clock.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a new section the following:

"The President is hereby empowered and directed to hold a naval review in the Bay of San Francisco, State of California, on or about the 15th day of January, 1915, in connection with the ceremonies incident to the opening of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition; and the President is hereby further empowered and directed to extend to foreign nations an invitation to send ships of war to join the United States Navy in rendezvous in Hampton Roads, State of Virginia, on or about the 15th day of December, 1914, the said ships of war to be escorted by the United States Navy through the Panama Canal to said Bay of San Francisco, there to participate in the naval review aforesaid."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the President to extend invitations to foreign countries to visit this exposition.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The SPEAKER. That point of order has already been made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which the House is now considering, to hold this American exposition in San Francisco, is an invitation to the foreign powers to participate in the exposition. The amendment offered by me is a continuation of that invitation to participate.

It provides that a naval review shall be held in the Bay of San Francisco, and previous to that that they shall rendezvous in Hampton Roads, with the idea of an official reception being held in the city of Washington, that the President of the United States may go down and start the procession off through the Panama Canal as they go to the Pacific Ocean, to rendezvous in the Bay of San Francisco. I think the amendment is clearly in order, because it is a continuation of the invitation proposed to be extended by this resolution.

Mr. GAINES. Would it be in order to amend that so that they should rendezvous at Charleston, W. Va.?

Mr. MAYNARD. Oh, I am willing that they should do that even.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia authorizes the President to invite the nations of the world to send warships to Hampton Roads prior to the opening of the canal, in order that they may proceed thence to this great interoceanic waterway, go through the canal, participate in its opening, and then proceed to San Francisco to participate again in the opening of the exposition there. It provides for the issuance of an invitation by the President of the United States just as the original resolution did. At the time of the opening of the great Kiel Canal in Germany, the German Government invited all the nations of the world to be represented by ships of war, and this amendment is simply in keeping with the precedents that have been set by foreign nations. It requires the issuance of an invitation on the part of this Nation by the President of the United States to foreign nations to participate in the opening of the exposition at San Francisco at a grand naval review in the Bay of San Francisco. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is entirely germane and is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution authorizes the President to issue an invitation or proclamation for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. to hold an exposition, to invite foreign nations to participate in that exposition. Here is an entirely new substantive proposition offered to this last resolution, a proposition which involves a naval exposition, both at Hampton Roads and at San Francisco.

Mr. MAYNARD. It does not add a dollar of expense.

Mr. MANN. There is no question of expense here at all. Nobody knows what it will ask. It can not be fairly claimed that to a substantive proposition authorizing the President to invite foreign nations to participate in a Panama-Pacific International exposition that there is germane to it another substantive proposition to hold a naval exposition. There is no relationship between the two; there is no relationship between holding an exposition in San Francisco and holding an exposition at Hampton Roads; and if there were a bill providing for a naval exposition at San Francisco it would not be in order to offer an amendment to provide that that exposition should be held in part at Hampton Roads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia would be in order, it would be in order to follow it up with a like amendment to invite the nations of the world to participate in an exposition at the Panama Canal itself. This resolution is limited solely to tendering an invitation, and it does not designate the character of the exposition whatsoever. The amendment proposes something distinct and separate from that involved in the original resolution.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the resolution, the only purpose of Congress is to request the President of the United States to invite the nations of the world to participate in the Panama Exposition at San Francisco. That is the sole purpose of this resolution. Anything outside of that which amounts to affirmative action on the part of the Government of the United States would not be germane to this resolution, and I do not think that it is in order for the reason that here is a corporation in San Francisco that does not ask the Government for one cent of money. The United States Government does not involve itself in one cent of expense. Not a dollar is to be appropriated by the Government. Now, here it is proposed to

tack on something else, to add a naval exposition. That, in my opinion, is foreign to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that this amendment is not germane. The joint resolution provides for an invitation to be extended by the President of the United States for an exposition to be held by California or by the people mentioned in the bill. This is a provision for a participation in that exposition by a naval review, a rendezvous at Hampton Roads, to pass through the canal, and a review at San Francisco. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding a new section, as follows:

"That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at said exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exposition to sell, for delivery at the close thereof, any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition in the exposition buildings or on the grounds, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when sold or withdrawn for consumption in the United States, shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of importation, and all penalties prescribed by law shall be applied and enforced against such articles and against the person who may be guilty of any illegal sale or withdrawal."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is already provided for by existing law.

Mr. MANN. And, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order it is not germane to the bill.

The SPEAKER. What existing law?

Mr. DALZELL. A paragraph in the existing tariff law provides for the admission of goods imported under such circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order as not being germane.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House recess until 4 o'clock. [Cries of "No!"]

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Would the answer to my former parliamentary inquiry preclude the taking of a vote at the present time by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair that it is not fair, under this rule that has been adopted by a full House, and Members being aware of its adoption, to proceed to vote upon this resolution until 4 o'clock.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I object. I would like to have about five minutes. There seems to be plenty of time.

Mr. MANN. Nearly 50 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is time to burn—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, have I the floor?

Mr. HEFLIN. For what length of time does the gentleman desire to speak?

Mr. GILLETT. Only a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to an hour, but he has 50 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not want more than a tenth part of that. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is time to be disposed of, and inasmuch as I seem to take a different position from anyone else on this bill, I would like to state it. I am opposed to any exposition, because in the past they have been extremely expensive, and the assurances which we have received on this floor in the past about the limit of expense have not been carried out. I was sorry to hear the proposition just made by the gentleman from Virginia, that we should have a naval parade starting at Hampton Roads and having the navies of the world our guests, and then go around through the canal and up to San Francisco. It seemed to me that that was an indication that this would follow the precedents of other expositions and lead into an expense of which we are not thinking now. Certainly nobody could give us more assurances than the gentlemen from South Carolina did some years ago, when they were asking for the Charleston Exposition, that it should not cost any more, and yet they came back to Congress and they logrolled through the House what they promised us they never would ask. The progress of other expositions has been somewhat similar in always costing the Government far more than was originally suggested.

Now, I voted for San Francisco because it seems to me California has made an unusually businesslike proposition. They are generous, they have limited themselves closely, and between the two propositions I mostly preferred San Francisco, but there is one question I would like to ask the gentleman from California in charge of the bill: In my neighborhood, and I think in the whole country east of the Rockies, the majority of the people during the Japanese-Russian war sympathized warmly with Japan. We have continued our sympathies and good will toward that vigorous and progressive people, and we have been shocked and disgusted with the conduct of California toward them, not merely the conduct of the rabble and hoodlums of California toward Japanese laborers, but the conduct apparently of people of culture and refinement in California toward educated representatives and officers of Japan. I wonder if it has represented fairly the general disposition of Californians toward orientals. If this exposition is in San Francisco, Japan will be its nearest neighbor; we should expect her to exhibit and attend there largely, and I would like to know whether you can give any assurances that toward this splendid, powerful people the temper of California will change, and that as the Nation's guests they will be treated with that friendly and respectful spirit they deserve.

Mr. KAHN. The people of California two years ago manifested their stand upon these questions so far as legislation is concerned. There were pending in the California Legislature at that time a number of bills that were considered harsh by the people of the East. The best answer I can make to the gentleman's question is this: Those bills failed of passage in the California Legislature. And I have not heard of any intention to begin an agitation of these questions at this time. So far as the friendly spirit of the people of California toward the Japanese is concerned, there have been numerous occasions when committees of Japanese have come to California and other Western States in recent months, and that friendly spirit has been made manifest. The visitors have been accorded most courteous treatment, and our citizens have gone to Japan in response to invitations that were extended by these Japanese to our business men—by these Japanese, if you please, who had been in the United States, who had been in California, who had been in San Francisco, and who had been entertained there in the kindest spirit.

It is but proper to state that, so far as the Asiatic question is concerned, the people of California and the people of the West generally have never asked for the exclusion of any but the laboring classes—the Asiatic coolie, if you please. That is all we have asked for. That is the only legislation that is on our statute books to-day. But to indicate to this House the attitude of the orientals toward San Francisco and her desire to secure this exposition I am pleased to state that the Chinese chamber of commerce at Hankow passed a resolution favoring San Francisco for the exposition city, and the Chinese chamber of commerce at Shanghai passed a resolution favoring San Francisco as the exposition city. They certainly would not have done so if they had had any apprehension that they would not receive courteous treatment in that city. We also have letters from the chambers of commerce in various German and Austrian cities expressing their preference for San Francisco as the exposition city, thus showing that there is an international feeling toward that city. But, so far as the Asiatic business man is concerned, he has been accorded in California such courteous treatment that he has been glad to extend to California business men cordial invitations to visit his country. A commission from our chamber of commerce, which left San Francisco about six months ago for the Orient, has just returned, and the gentlemen who composed that commission, in reports made to the citizens, announced that the most cordial and friendly business and social relationship had existed throughout the entire trip between the members of the commission and the peoples visited. I think that explains the attitude of the people of San Francisco.

Mr. GILLETT. That would seem to explain the attitude of Japan.

Mr. KAHN. Surely the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] does not suppose that Japan would assume this attitude if her people had been badly treated in California?

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman, then, mean that he thinks there will be courteous, friendly, and respectful treatment in California, by public opinion and sentiment, socially and industrially, toward them?

Mr. KAHN. I am positive of it; and not only that, I am positive that both China and Japan will make exhibits at San Francisco the like of which have never been seen in any section of the globe.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from California in what way he can insure, or this corporation insure,

the protection to Japan or any other foreign nation, without the representatives of the United States or through the Government of the United States.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, of course, after all, it is a pretty hard matter for any man to guarantee anything positively in this life. [Applause.] But this fact remains—and I stated this matter before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions—that in California we have had our racial troubles. There has been legislation by the Government of the United States against the admission of the coolies of Asia, and that is the only kind of legislation we have ever asked for, and it is the only kind of legislation we have ever secured. We have never had any objection to the business men, to the professional men, to the students, to the Asiatics who come here for the purpose of traveling for pleasure, and those classes have always been highly welcomed. But an effort has been made to make a great deal of the fact that once in a while a San Francisco hoodlum might have pulled the queue of a Chinaman, but the Chinamen themselves are now cutting off their queues.

Mr. SIMS. They have to do so, or they will have them pulled off.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, there have been lynchings of foreigners in other communities, but we have never had anything of that kind out on the Pacific coast. The Chinese and Japanese who have come to us, once they are on the ground, have been invariably accorded all the rights and privileges extended to the citizens of any foreign nation. Of course, we can not control all our hoodlums any more than you can control all the hoodlums of Boston or all the hoodlums of New Orleans or all the hoodlums of New York. We do the best we can, and you do the best you can; but the great numbers of Chinese and Japanese who are in this country have never made any serious complaint that they have been treated badly by the people of the Pacific coast. I believe it was Patrick Henry who said: "I know no light by which my feet are guided save the lamp of experience."

Judging by the experience of the past I apprehend that there will be no serious complaint about the treatment of orientals in San Francisco.

Mr. GILLET. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman stated in his remarks that when the exposition was held at Charleston, S. C., the people of South Carolina gave assurances that no appropriation would be asked of Congress, and that subsequently a bill was logrolled through this House. I think it but fair to say that Col. Elliott, who at that time represented the city of Charleston, offered a resolution appropriating \$75,000 for the Government to participate in the exposition. He stated that it was not his intention to ask for any appropriation other than the cost of the Government exhibit. That is the only assurance that was given by the people of South Carolina or any part of them. Col. Elliott himself never did violate the promise that he made to Congress. Later there came to this House in the sundry civil bill an amendment put on in the Senate providing an appropriation of \$150,000 for the Charleston Exposition. That amendment was not suggested by Col. Elliott, who was the only person that ever gave any assurance on this floor upon that subject. It was not participated in by him when it was before the House, for he was absent; but it went through this House, so far as I know, without any logrolling, except that there happened to be in the same bill an appropriation of \$400,000 for the Pan American Exposition at Buffalo. The two propositions went through, neither one of which, probably, would have gone through alone. I know of no logrolling.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to offend the susceptibilities of the gentleman or of the State of South Carolina. That came to me as a recollection and a good illustration of what we have suffered, I think, more or less, in all these expositions. I remember particularly in that case that Mr. Elliott made that promise. To be sure, it only bound himself, but it was understood, I think, at the time he made it that it bound the State, and that he was representing the exposition; and I remember, too, that he did carefully abstain when it came up again. When this subsequent appropriation, which was in direct contradiction of his statement, was urged, he wisely absented himself. I confess it did not seem to me that really relieved the situation, although it relieved him personally. I simply used that as an illustration of the danger that all these expositions have led to of constantly coming back to Congress and getting what they at first said they never would ask.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, the appropriation for the payment of the debt of the Charleston Exposition did not originate in the House. It

originated in the Senate, and came over to the House as an amendment to the sundry civil or general deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman has made some reference to the possibility of our coming back to the Congress for an appropriation. I want to assure the gentleman that the people of California studied this question very carefully when they made the moves they have made. In talking over the matter of expositions with the Members of this House I soon found that there was a decided feeling against extending Government aid to any exposition. It was said that the people were practically "exposition sick," and I was assured by scores of the Members of this House that they would never vote for any exposition measure that carried with it a single dollar of Government appropriation. I reported the sentiment of the House to the directors of our exposition company, and they decided that we had the ability to finance this exposition without governmental aid. Now, the statement has been made here that we occupy rather an anomalous position, that we are inviting people to our feast, and yet we ourselves would be absent. I want to tell the gentleman and the Members of this House that a similar provision was inserted in the resolution of invitation extended by the President to foreign nations at the time of the Centennial Exposition in 1876. A resolution similar to the pending resolution authorized the President of the United States to extend an invitation to foreign nations to exhibit at the Centennial Exposition. That resolution was passed in this House without much opposition. It went over to the Senate, and then some Senator arose and said, in effect, "You are going to fasten on this Government a great big expense. You are inviting the nations of the world to participate in your exposition, and in consequence you will have to foot the bills." Some other Senator at that time also expressed sentiments similar to those suggested here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

The very simile of inviting people to your table and letting them pay for the food, while you contributed nothing toward the feast, was used. The Senate, nevertheless, voted for an amendment to the bill which exempted the Government from any financial liability, and the invitation went to the nations of the world in that form, or rather the invitation was extended with the express knowledge that our Government was not to foot the bills. But the bill which originated the Centennial Exposition authorized the Government to inaugurate that exposition. It inaugurated the exposition on behalf of the Government, and later on when the gentlemen in charge of the exposition found that they did not have money enough to complete it, basing their claim on the express language that the exposition had been inaugurated by the Government of the United States, they made a successful appeal to the Congress and the money was loaned to the Centennial Exposition Co., and, as I understand it, every dollar of that money was subsequently repaid.

The basis for the Government loan was predicated on the proposition that the Government of the United States had inaugurated their exposition.

San Francisco, realizing the latent possibility hidden in those sentences in the bill, decided that it would burn its bridges behind it, and that it would never ask for a single dollar, either as a loan or as an appropriation. Therefore, in framing the resolution that is about to be passed upon by this House, we decided to leave out of this resolution any proposition that would enable anybody in California, at any time, to come to the Congress of the United States and ask for a single 5-cent piece in aid of this exposition. It is an attitude that, in my judgment, should commend itself to the membership of this House, because no community in the history of the United States has ever been so stricken as have been the people of San Francisco; and yet, in spite of the calamity, in spite of the disaster, after having expended upward of \$400,000,000 in rebuilding the city, they have the courage, and the nerve, and the strength, and the financial ability to go down into their own pockets and raise \$17,500,000 for this exposition. It is as much money as had the city of Chicago with her Government loan to enable her to give a World's Columbian Exposition that would be a credit to the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that when we started I, as a member of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, asked how long a time he wanted, and he said two or three minutes.

Mr. GILLET. I have not used the time.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman has proceeded for 21 minutes, or gentlemen on that side have, in favor of the resolution, and those of us opposed to it have not had an opportunity to speak against it.

Mr. GILLET. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HEFLIN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. GILLET. Very well; I want to use a few minutes myself, and then I will yield it to the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from California that I appreciate the unselfishness and businesslike conduct of the State of California. It is largely for that reason that I voted for San Francisco—that and my sympathy with the great misfortune and marvelous recovery which the city has experienced. I congratulate the gentlemen and the managers of this exposition that they apparently have inaugurated an entirely new method of starting an exposition, and I trust that it will be carried out in the same spirit. I was not critical of it, as the gentleman appreciates and as my vote shows.

Mr. KAHN. I assure the gentleman that I knew his statement was not made in criticism, but I want to explain fully the reasons that actuated us.

Mr. GILLET. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama 15 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution of the gentleman from California. I think it puts this Government in a most ridiculous attitude to be extending an invitation to foreign countries to come to an exposition unless it is to be an exposition inaugurated by and given in the name of the Government of the United States. I do not think that this Government ought to be asked to invite people of foreign countries to a State fair in California. San Francisco wants this exposition, and she has been exceedingly active to secure it. She has secured the consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and now the proper course for this House to take, if we are not to provide for an exhibit at that exposition, if we are not to inaugurate the exposition itself, in celebration of the opening of the great Panama Canal, the only course to pursue is for Congress to have nothing to do with it and let the Legislature of California issue its own invitation and provide for the conduct of its own State fair. [Applause.]

I appreciate the pluck and enterprise of San Francisco. I remember when that great calamity, the earthquake, overtook her a few years ago. This House voted \$2,500,000 to aid her then, and she was aided from other sections of the country by a great and generous people. And I rejoice, Mr. Speaker, that over the ruins of the old city a new and mighty Frisco has arisen. All honor to the pluck, industry, and enterprise of her people. [Applause.]

While San Francisco is now a splendid city and California a great and growing State, we can not conceive, Mr. Speaker, how anyone can seriously contend that the celebration of the opening of the Panama Canal should be held in that far, far away western city. [Applause.] If San Francisco wants to celebrate that great occasion by some State and city function, I shall not object. Let her do so. But, Mr. Speaker, the opening of the Panama Canal ought to be celebrated by a great national exposition, and it ought to be held in the nearest city to the canal itself. [Applause.] San Francisco is more than 3,000 miles away, and, by water, we are told that it would take three weeks to make the trip from San Francisco to the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, nobody seems to know how long it takes a man to go to San Francisco and return. The Members of Congress from that far-away State spend their holidays in Washington. They do not have time enough to go home and come back again during the holidays. If distance cuts such a figure with these men who live there, Mr. Speaker, how can they expect people generally, who do not have to go, to make that long journey to an exposition celebrating the opening of a canal which is itself closer to them than the exposition is? [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I have not the time. The gentleman, in the minority report, Mr. Speaker, makes the suggestion that the people of the United States ought to "journey" to San Francisco. The word "journey" is an appropriate word. It suggests a long, long trip, and that is what it will require to reach California. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is still a mooted question as to where California is. John S. McGroarty, a Californian, writing in the Los Angeles Times, says, "The American continent is the back yard of California." Mr. Speaker, that is the limit. Mr. McGroarty quotes Col. Roosevelt, who once said, "California is not in the West; it is west of the West." [Laughter.] And still the question is, Where is California? Mr. McGroarty quotes from another author concerning California, who says:

It lies not in the East or West,
But like a scroll unfurled,
It lies where God hath hung it,
Down the middle of the world.

[Applause and laughter.]

Now, who wants to take a chance, Mr. Speaker, at an exposition held on a thing hanging in the middle of the world? [Laughter.] But we are told that—

Off the flowers of perfect bliss
Are plucked on danger's precipice.

[Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, who wants to go to the middle of the world to attend an exposition, and who is able to make the expensive trip? Or who has the time for such a long, long journey?

Another in this same paper tells us that California lies midway between the Orient and the Occident. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is as far as Red Egypt and lies somewhere twixt the eremite star of the Orient desert's lone dawn and the porch of the chambers of rest. [Applause and laughter.] The life of the average man is too short, Mr. Speaker, to undertake such a long journey, and the purse of the average man is too feeble to stand the strain incident to such a long, long trip. [Applause.]

But our friends tell us, Mr. Speaker, that if you go to California you will never come back, and another writer in a California paper, the Los Angeles Times, says:

Few of those who come here from the East ever return, for the air of the ultimate West is like the fabled fruit of the lotus—those who once taste of it forever linger about the tree.

Mr. Speaker, in this same paper I find another reason why some of those who go to California never return. It is given in the Los Angeles Daily Times of January 12. That paper says that James Appelgate, 87 years old, was put in the county jail on a charge of vagrancy, that he was sentenced to prison by a California justice as a vagrant without visible means of support. "Appelgate is a native of Pennsylvania," the paper goes on to say, and that "he once lived at Atlantic City, where he built her first pleasure pier, and he has promoted various amusement places." Ah, Mr. Speaker, this poor old man, that God has with His image blessed, has seen better and brighter days. When in the vigor of young manhood he thought of the happiness of others and contributed to their pleasure. But, Mr. Speaker, in an unguarded moment he fell a victim to the song of the western siren and was lured to California. [Applause and laughter.] There, in that land of transcendent beauty and riches, about which we have just heard so much, the evil genius of that enchanted realm unloosed his purse strings, and its contents are gone. And now "old age and want, O ill-matched pair," present a sad and pitiable spectacle in James Appelgate's confinement in a California prison cell on the charge of vagrancy.

Mr. Speaker, is this a sample of California's Christian charity? Is this the hospitality dispensed to the stranger within her gates? [Applause.] Is this where she wants us to go with the great Panama Exposition?

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet!

[Laughter.]

Old age is honorable, Mr. Speaker, and it is no crime to be poor. The Scripture tells us that "The poor ye have with you always," and "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these ye did it unto Me." Mr. Speaker, our friends from California can somewhat atone for this unkind and cruel treatment of an old, old man by this California justice by making up a purse and sending him home. I am poor myself, Mr. Speaker, but I will contribute to the sum necessary for this beneficent purpose. Let the old man behold again the scenes that delighted him when a boy and die among his friends in the East and sleep at last with his Pennsylvania fathers. [Applause.] While I know that his return would contradict the boast of all Californians, that whenever a man goes to California he never returns [applause and laughter], I appeal to these gentlemen to make an exception in this instance and remove the reasons for James Appelgate's long stay and let him depart in peace. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this same paper, the Los Angeles Times, sent out with arguments to induce us to vote for the exposition to go to California, I find the story of a fair-haired youth who heard the call of the West bidding him on to California. He responded, as did James Appelgate, and he, too, was hauled into a California court on a charge of vagrancy—yes, vagrancy, Mr. Speaker, in that enchanted realm, that land of romance and of song. [Applause and laughter.] The story goes that he had taken a girl named Hortense [laughter] to a theater in a town in California and thence to a fashionable café suggested to him by the girl; there they ate and drank and were merry. Owing to the long distance to California and the heavy expense of getting there this young man's money had run so low that on that night he had only \$14 left. [Applause.] Yet, Mr. Speaker, before the wild noon of night the young man's \$14 had been expended and the girl shook him and left him penniless, a stranger among strangers in that far-away land of the West. [Laughter.] Cruel, heartless Hortense! [Laughter.]

And then what happened to him, Mr. Speaker? A policeman got him and locked him up on a charge of vagrancy; and, speaking of the girl, the café, and the show, this is what the young man said in court:

Judge, that's where Hortense steered me,
And that is where she queered me.

[Laughter.]

She did me brown, then threw me down;
She left me broke, a living joke,
The butt of this California town.

[Laughter.]

Judge, I am sorry to say that I must make to-day
This sad and convincing report;
When the cops ran me in I was broke and had been
Without visible means of support.
So put me where there's no need to roam
Till I can get a check from home.

[Applause and laughter.]

So, Mr. Speaker, from this California paper I gather the reasons why some people who go to California never return. [Applause and laughter.] The reasons are strong. They are in the shape of iron doors and prison bars. [Applause and laughter.] Why, Mr. Speaker, if a man expresses the desire to leave California, if he looks at all homesick, they straightway lock him up on the charge of vagrancy. [Laughter.] No wonder so many young men and old men never return from California. No wonder the State is filling up so fast, and no wonder the population of California is increasing so rapidly. [Applause and laughter.] Mr. Speaker, this old man from the State of Pennsylvania longs to go again to the places that knew him in happier days, and this fair-haired youth from—I know not where—full of regrets and sad experience, is awaiting a check from home, and he is yearning to be delivered from the land of Hortense and the prune-haunted cell of the vagrant. [Applause and laughter.]

Let us not be deceived, Mr. Speaker, by the seductive siren song of the far, far West, to go to that human paradise, that realm of perfect bliss, where old age and youth mingle together in a common prison cell upon the delightful charge of vagrancy. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we ought to celebrate in appropriate fashion the completion of the great Panama Canal. The completion of this canal will mark an era of industrial advancement and open to us commercial possibilities of marvelous magnitude. It is fitting that the Panama Exposition should be held at New Orleans, because this is the nearest city to the canal itself, and if you could consult the citizenship of our country upon this question I believe 9 out of every 10 would say hold it at the nearest point to the canal, so that for the least cost possible and in the shortest time we can see the canal. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we of the South take especial pride in the fact that a southern man, Senator John T. Morgan, of Alabama, did more than any other man to educate the American people to the importance of constructing a great Isthmian Canal. [Applause.] For 30 years in the United States Senate he advocated with great power and eloquence the digging of this canal, and he convinced our people that a canal would be of incalculable value. He urged its importance to the cotton growers of the South and showed how it would give to us new markets for our raw cotton and our cotton goods. This is what Senator McCreary, of Kentucky, said of him:

He was the ablest and most eloquent advocate of this greatest engineering enterprise of all time. But for him this canal which will soon unite the Atlantic with the Pacific would not now be under construction. True, he favored the Nicaragua route and was disappointed because this route was not decided upon, but the fact remains that because of his constant active and effective advocacy of the building of an Isthmian Canal makes him the father of this the greatest engineering feat of all time.

Senator CULLOM, of Illinois, said that perhaps no man in this country did as much to secure an interoceanic canal as did Senator Morgan. Senator Foraker, of Ohio, said that Senator Morgan did more hard work and labored more incessantly along every line of opportunity to secure the construction of an interoceanic canal than any other man. He favored the Nicaraguan route, and all felt that he had labored so zealously, consistently, self-sacrificingly, and patriotically that in every personal sense he thoroughly merited a victory. Senator Daniel, of Virginia, has said:

You can not think of Morgan without thinking of the Isthmian Canal.

As Maury was to the science of the ocean tides and currents and to the courses of the merchantmen that covered the oceans, so Morgan was to the Isthmian Canal. Senator BURTON, of Ohio, then a Member of the House, said:

His name in history will be most identified with the Isthmian Canal. In season and out of season he favored this long-desired waterway be-

tween the two oceans, and it is but a just tribute to him to say that he, more than anyone else, contributed to the triumphant accomplishment of that great enterprise. It is greatly to be regretted that his life was not prolonged until the final day when this canal shall be opened to the traffic of the world that his eyes might have beheld the result of his efforts.

CHAMP CLARK said:

Justly he must be considered the father of the Isthmian Canal.

Mr. CLAYTON, my able and distinguished colleague, said:

When the two oceans shall have been united by a canal across the Isthmus, this great work will stand as an imperishable monument to the statesmanship, the persistence, and wisdom of Senator Morgan.

Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate for this Government, yes, it is the duty of this Government, to build at the Panama Canal, when it is completed, a monument to Senator Morgan. [Applause.] I would place upon a high and broad pedestal the figure of Senator Morgan and inscribe on the marble the story of his efforts to secure the canal, and I would chisel at his feet the words, "The father of the Isthmian Canal." [Applause.]

We ought to have a great exposition at the nearest point possible to this canal. It ought to be held at that point which can be reached by the greatest number of people in the shortest time and for the least money possible. [Applause.]

It ought to be held at that point which will afford the best opportunity for making exhibits of our products that will increase our foreign trade and nearest to those people who will be induced to trade with us. If we do that we will hold it at New Orleans, and the people from whom we can expect much in the near future are the people of South and Central America, and the product the thorough advertisement of which will bring most money into our country is cotton, and New Orleans is the place for the greatest cotton exhibit in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we hold this exposition at New Orleans it will be the means of increasing our trade hundreds of millions of dollars with the South and Central American Republics. [Applause.]

Let San Francisco have a State fair, if she wants it, but do not let this opportunity pass for holding an exposition near the canal, the conduct of which will be the means of bringing millions of money into this country.

We need to build up, and we are anxious to build up, our trade with South and Central America, and New Orleans is the most convenient point for these people to visit. They will come there and make an exhibit of their products, and there they will see an exhibition of American products such as the world has never seen. [Applause.]

When the 600,000,000 people of the Far East get into communication with us by way of Panama our trade with them will increase at a marvelous rate, and the holding of this exposition at New Orleans would be worth more to the American people in increasing our trade with foreign countries than could possibly come from holding the exposition at far-off San Francisco. [Applause.]

Draw a circle with New Orleans as its center. Make the radius 1,500 miles, and within that circle will be the Panama Canal, and its nearest metropolitan seaport will be New Orleans. Sixty-five million people interested in the celebration will be within that ring. This is more than two-thirds of the ninety-odd millions of people in the United States.

If the exposition is held at New Orleans, the poor people of our country can attend it, and they will attend it, but if you have it at San Francisco only the rich will be able to go. [Applause.]

New Orleans is accessible to most of the people of Latin America. It is more convenient to three-fourths of our own people.

The success of the exposition depends upon the number of people from this and other countries who will attend it. If we have it at New Orleans more people from Central and South America will attend it than would if held at San Francisco, and we will have a cotton exhibit there that will command the attention and admiration of the world, and that exhibit, Mr. Speaker, will result in increasing marvelously our trade with these countries.

And, while cotton is only produced in the South, all of our people are benefited by good prices for cotton and by the expansion of our cotton-goods trade. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen boast of the products of the California gold mines. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Alabama cotton fields bring annually more gold into our country than all the gold mines of California produce. [Applause.] The gold mine of the American people is the cotton belt of the United States, and it will produce gold and give to America the balance of trade long after the gold mines of California have been abandoned and bats and owls inhabit them. [Applause and laughter.]

Cotton can break the iron bands of panics as no other product in America can. It can bring gold from foreign countries when all other products fail. [Applause.]

Give us this exposition in the South—at New Orleans—and you will give the people of the East, of the North, and of the West an opportunity to behold this Eden of America. [Applause.]

We want you to come down into Dixie and see this beautiful cotton belt. It is 1,400 miles long from east to west and 500 miles wide. It is more than a cotton belt, Mr. Speaker. It is the land of diversified farming. We can produce everything that grows in the kingdom of agriculture. The farmer of the South is now a wide-awake, thoroughgoing business man. He is just beginning to realize the vast value of his agricultural resources. Corn is now being produced on a larger scale than ever. Wheat and oats and hay and rice and everything for man and beast is now being produced on the soil of the South. [Applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that ours is the greatest country on earth and every section of it can boast of some form of natural beauty. But I invite you, our brethren of the East, of the North, and of the West, to come down into Dixie and behold the most beautiful, rich, and picturesque section of this the greatest country in the world. [Applause.]

Her water power is the most attractive and marvelous in the world. Her soil is as rich as the fertile lands that blessed and made famous the great valley of the Nile. Her navigable streams are the finest on earth. Her beautiful valleys, carpeted with bermuda and clover, alfalfa and blue grass, are rich in delicious odors and pleasing to the most artistic eye. Her mountains, green with wild grasses, and adorned with the greatest variety of graceful trees, are watered by streams fringed with ferns and wild roses, and the mockingbird sings there all the day long. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, this mountain scenery of the Southland is more beautiful than the famed hanging gardens of Babylon. This romantic realm is more enchanting than the fabled land of the fairy gods. [Applause.]

Come down to this land of poetry, chivalry, and song, and drink at her fountains of eternal youth or wander with us in the balm-breathing gardens of Alabama. [Applause.] There good water and pure air constitute a life elixir—the finest health tonic in the world. [Applause.]

The birds sing the sweetest in the Southland,
The horses are the fleetest in the Southland,
The women are the sweetest
And the men are the neatest
In the cotton-growing,
Rice-producing Southland.

[Applause.]

Give us the exposition at New Orleans, and when the year 1915 comes around you will see an exposition more generally attended by the people of this and other countries than would be possible at any other point in the United States. You will see the greatest exhibit of American products that ever graced an American exposition, and we will have there a cotton exhibit the like of which the world has never seen, and following this exposition and these exhibits will come an expansion of our trade with every country in the world. [Applause.]

We want you to visit us in the Southland.

Come when the springtime comes,
When the gold-belted bee in the blossom hums,
When in billows of pink the peach blooms blow,
And apple and plum scatter swirls of snow,
When the fern droops low by the woodland stream,
And the gray dove coos in a blissful dream,
When the rippling wheat hides the partridge nest,
And the land of the South is at her best!

[Loud and prolonged applause.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress, 12 years ago, propositions for expositions in various parts of the United States were the order of the day. I came here committed in my mind to support the St. Louis Exposition; I came here favoring the Buffalo Exposition, and of course, in a modest way, heartily in favor of the exposition at Charleston, S. C. I voted, as I felt at that time, for an exposition to be held at Buffalo, at Charleston, at St. Louis, and, from a financial standpoint, those expositions were failures. The time came when Buffalo came to Congress to ask a deficiency appropriation of \$500,000, to make up what the exposition company had lost during that exposition. The exposition company of Charleston, S. C., came here and asked \$160,000, and that was the occasion that the gentleman from Massachusetts speaks of when he mentioned the exposition in South Carolina.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not raise my voice to give this deficiency appropriation to Charleston until it was

settled and sure that Buffalo would get the \$500,000. On a roll call of the House, in the Fifty-seventh Congress, the House of Representatives awarded \$500,000 to make up the deficiency for Buffalo, and then, on the very next vote, refused to give the \$160,000 for Charleston.

Yes, I did all I could to have fair dealing prevail—that fish should not be made of one and fowl of the other. I won that fight for Charleston because the House of Representatives, because the Speaker at that time, Mr. Speaker Henderson, because the membership of this House, almost without exception, realized they could not decently give to Buffalo \$500,000 and then refuse \$160,000 to Charleston. I make this statement in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Yes, I led that fight for Charleston; but I want to say this: When I finished it, I washed my hands of appropriating money to any exposition in this country; and not since then have I voted for an appropriation to any exposition company. I said I would not do so, and to-day I have carried out the promise I made to myself at that time.

New Orleans is the greatest of the southern cities, situated where naturally almost every man in the South would be inclined to support an exposition, but they asked an appropriation of \$1,000,000 from the National Government.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Just for an exhibit.

Mr. FINLEY. I understand it was for an exhibit; yet, nevertheless, it was an appropriation out of the National Treasury, and no matter what the purpose was the money would go out of the Treasury and would be paid by the Government for the purposes of the exposition. So, Mr. Speaker, when San Francisco came up and asked not one dollar of appropriation, and when her Representatives here upon this floor consistently advocate a resolution that only asks Congress to request the President of the United States to issue an invitation to the nations of the world, I could have but one choice between the two propositions. Yes, I voted for San Francisco, and for that reason—one exposition asking for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 and the other not one cent.

It has been stated here on the floor of the House that the appropriation would be made, anyway; but we have seen one proposition after another ruled out of order, and this House has not up to this time voted any appropriation for San Francisco, nor do I believe it will vote one cent for the purposes of that exposition. And I wish to say, when the proposition comes up, if it does come, my vote will be cast against the appropriation, and if any appropriation is inserted I will vote against the San Francisco proposition.

And in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], who mentioned the Charleston Exposition as one of the instances where they came back and asked for additional appropriation, the Charleston Exposition obtained favorable action in this House after the exposition was over and after it had failed under similar circumstances that relief was granted to Buffalo. I have come to the conclusion that Congress should not vote money out of the National Treasury for expositions, and I do not propose at this time or in the future to vote to spend the people's money in this way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] and five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is an impossibility.

Mr. GILLET. I divide the time between the two.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that the gentleman can not yield time to us together, with the authority to the prior speaker to offer an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] has the floor.

Mr. GILLET. I wish to give each of the gentlemen half of the time. I do not know which comes first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can give his time, but can not give his time with the right to offer an amendment without yielding the floor.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] half of the time that is remaining.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I ask that an amendment be read in my time for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "ocean," line 8, page 2:

"And that the allotment of space in said exposition and the award of premiums to foreign exhibitors shall be supervised and controlled by a joint commission of four members, two of whom shall be appointed by the exposition company herein named, two by the President of the United States, and in the event of their disagreement one addition, who shall be chosen by the four commissioners above mentioned."

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was only read for information and is not before the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] is recognized.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the original resolution is to stamp this exposition with a national character. Otherwise this contest which took place on the floor of this House to-day would never have been had. The proposition now is that this resolution leaves the United States Government with no control whatsoever over this exposition or the manner in which it shall be conducted after it has given it a national character. My proposition in the amendment is simply to impose another condition precedent to the extension of this invitation by the President of the United States to the nations of the world. The present resolution provides that he shall not extend the invitation until he is satisfied that a suitable site has been had and that five or seven or fifteen million dollars have been raised. Now, I add this condition, that he shall also be satisfied that there is a board of award, two of whom shall be appointed by the President of the United States and two by the exposition company, to make awards to foreign exhibitors, to do away with the possibility of the contentions and strife that have been suggested through all this debate here to-day; and if the gentleman from California, who has fathered this project, had any opposition to allowing the President of the United States to name two men to participate in the awards to exhibitors from foreign countries, then it is news to me. I will ask that the amendment be considered as pending.

Mr. FASSETT. I make a point of order against it.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. That my amendment may be considered as pending at the close of the debate at 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his amendment may be considered as pending at 4 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. FASSETT. I object.

Mr. GILLET. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I realize that a discussion of the proposed amendment is academic inasmuch as it is not pending. The provisions of this amendment violate the very principle that many of us on the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions have been contending for for many years. It is because of just such provisions that I have voted against every industrial exposition that has been proposed. If that amendment were to be incorporated in this bill I should vote against the San Francisco exposition. It does nothing more nor less than open the door for persons to come before Congress, as they have frequently done already, and say, "By the appointment of your commission to control our affairs you assumed the responsibility for the failure or success of our exposition. If you had given us our own way we might have made it a success. Now you are morally bound to liquidate any debt that may have been incurred."

Mr. Speaker, it is by no means settled as yet whether or not it is to be the policy of this country to inaugurate or control or supervise expositions. I think, however, that the majority of the House has determined never again to grant direct pecuniary aid to such enterprises.

I believe the next step we shall take, and I am glad to see that we have inaugurated it in this bill to-day, is to say to promoters, "Gentlemen, if you desire expositions, you may have them at your own expense. We will invite foreign nations here, provided we know that your exposition will be a success, but beyond that we must not go. We will put the responsibility for hospitality to foreign representatives and for justice to foreign exhibitors on the shoulders of the government of the State in which your exposition is held." Such is precisely the course we have adopted to-day. These foreigners will not find themselves, as some gentlemen apparently think, at the mercy of any exposition company. They will participate in an exposition controlled by a joint commission composed of representatives of the government of California and of the exposition company.

It has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] that in the past it would have seemed extraordinary if the National Government had invited the representatives of

foreign nations to an entertainment and then disclaimed any responsibility to entertain them. There might be some ground for this view, were it not for the fact that such has in effect been exactly our practice in relation to former expositions. The United States in no case has undertaken to entertain the representatives of foreign nations. Always, at all events since I have been in Congress, the entertainment of the representatives of foreign nations has been at the charge, under the control, and at the expense of the local exposition company.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, under the rule the previous question operates. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana calls for the yeas and nays. [After counting.] Twenty-four gentlemen have arisen. Under the last vote that is not a sufficient number.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed to ordering the yeas and nays will rise and be counted. [After counting.] Twenty-four Members have arisen demanding the yeas and nays and 130 on the other side. Not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 43, answered "present" 7, not voting 77, as follows:

YEAS—258.

Adair	Ellis	Kahn	Olcott
Alexander, Mo.	Elvins	Kelifer	Olmsted
Alexander, N. Y.	Englebright	Kelher	Padgett
Allen	Esch	Kendall	Palmer, A. M.
Ames	Fassett	Kennedy, Iowa	Palmer, H. W.
Anderson	Finley	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Parker
Andrus	Fish	Kinhead, N. J.	Parsons
Ansberry	Focht	Kitchin	Payne
Ashbrook	Foelker	Knapp	Pearre
Austin	Fornes	Knowland	Peters
Barchfeld	Foss	Kopp	Pickett
Barclay	Foster, Ill.	Korbly	Plumley
Barnard	Fuller	Kronmiller	Poinexter
Barnhart	Gaines	Kustermann	Pratt
Bartholdt	Gallagher	Lafean	Pray
Bartlett, Nev.	Gardner, Mass.	Lamb	Prince
Bates	Gardner, Mich.	Langley	Rainey
Beall, Tex.	Gardner, N. J.	Latta	Rauch
Bingham	Garrett	Law	Reeder
Boehne	Godwin	Lawrence	Richardson
Booher	Goldfogle	Lenroot	Riordan
Borland	Good	Lever	Roberts
Boutell	Goulden	Lindbergh	Rothermel
Burgess	Graff	Lloyd	Rucker, Colo.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Longworth	Sabath
Burke, S. Dak.	Graham, Pa.	Lundin	Scott
Burleson	Grant	McCall	Shackelford
Butler	Greene	McCreary	Sheffield
Calder	Griest	McDermott	Sherwood
Calderhead	Gronna	McHenry	Smith, Cal.
Campbell	Guernsey	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Iowa
Cantrill	Hamer	McKinney	Smith, Mich.
Carter	Hamilton	McLachlan, Cal.	Southwick
Cassidy	Hamlin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sperry
Chapman	Hammond	Macon	Spight
Clark, Mo.	Hanna	Madden	Stafford
Cline	Hardwick	Madison	Stanley
Cocks, N. Y.	Hardy	Maguire, Nebr.	Steenerson
Cole	Harrison	Malby	Stephens, Tex.
Conry	Havens	Mann	Sterling
Cooper, Pa.	Hawley	Martin, Colo.	Stevens, Minn.
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Martin, S. Dak.	Sulloway
Cowles	Helm	Massey	Sulzer
Cox, Ind.	Henry, Conn.	Maynard	Swasey
Cox, Ohio	Henry, Tex.	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Creager	Higgins	Miller, Kans.	Taylor, Ohio
Crow	Hinshaw	Miller, Minn.	Thistlewood
Crumacker	Hitchcock	Mitchell	Tilson
Cullo	Hobson	Mondell	Tou Velle
Currier	Hollingsworth	Moore, Pa.	Turnbull
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	Moore, Tex.	Volstead
Davidson	Howland	Morgan, Mo.	Vreeland
Davis	Hubbard, Iowa	Morgan, Okla.	Wanger
Dawson	Hughes, Ga.	Morrison	Washburn
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Morse	Weeks
Dickinson	Hughes, W. Va.	Moss	Weisse
Diekema	Hull, Iowa	Moxley	Wheeler
Dixon, Ind.	Hull, Tenn.	Murphy	Wiley
Dodds	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Wilson, Ill.
Douglas	Humphreys, Miss.	Nelson	Wilson, Pa.
Draper	James	Nicholls	Woods, Iowa
Driscoll, D. A.	Jamieson	Norris	Young, Mich.
Driscoll, M. E.	Johnson, Ohio	Nye	Young, N. Y.
Durey	Jones	O'Connell	
Dwight	Joyce		

NAYS—43.

Adamson	Broussard	Clark, Fla.	Edwards, Ga.
Aiken	Byrns	Collier	Estopinal
Bartlett, Ga.	Candler	Dickson, Miss.	Ferris
Bowers	Cary	Dupre	Fitzgerald

Floyd, Ark.	Houston	Robinson	Thomas, Ky.
Garner, Tex.	Lively	Roddenbery	Thomas, N. C.
Gillett	Oldfield	Rodenberg	Wallace
Glass	Page	Sims	Watkins
Gregg	Pujo	Slisson	Webb
Hay	Randell, Tex.	Small	Wickliffe
Hedlin	Ransdell, La.	Smith, Tex.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Brantley	Ellerbe	Howell, N. J.	Moon, Tenn.
Clayton	Flood, Va.	McMorran	

NOT VOTING—77.

Anthony	Foster, Vt.	Legare	Sheppard
Bell, Ga.	Fowler	Lindsay	Sherley
Bennet, N. Y.	Garner, Pa.	Livingston	Simmons
Bennett, Ky.	Gill, Md.	Loud	Slayden
Bradley	Gill, Mo.	Loudenslager	Slomp
Burleigh	Gillespie	Lowden	Snapp
Burnett	Goebel	McGuire, Okla.	Sparkman
Byrd	Gordon	McKinley, Ill.	Sturgiss
Capron	Hamill	Millington	Talbott
Carlin	Haugen	Moon, Pa.	Tawney
Coudrey	Heald	Morehead	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Hill	Mudd	Thomas, Ohio
Craig	Howard	Murdock	Townsend
Cravens	Hubbard, W. Va.	Patterson	Underwood
Denby	Huff	Pou	Willett
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Reid	Wood, N. J.
Dies	Johnson, S. C.	Rhinock	Woodyard
Edwards, Ky.	Kennedy, Ohio	Rucker, Mo.	
Fairchild	Langham	Saunders	
Fordney	Lee	Sharp	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HEALD with Mr. CLAYTON.

Mr. MOREHEAD with Mr. POU.

Mr. HILL with Mr. BOEHNE.

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. RODDENBERY.

Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BELL of Georgia.

Mr. BENNET of New York with Mr. BYRD.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. COVINGTON.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. CRAVENS.

Mr. DENBY with Mr. DENT.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky with Mr. DIES.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. GILL of Missouri.

Mr. GARNER of Pennsylvania with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. LANGHAM with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina.

Mr. MILLINGTON with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. STURGISS with Mr. REID.

Mr. THOMAS of Ohio with Mr. RUCKER of Missouri.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. WOOD of New Jersey with Mr. SHERLEY.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. MOON of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

THE LATE SENATOR JONATHAN P. DOLLIVER.

Mr. HUBBARD of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following order (No. 22).

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That there be a session of the House at 12 m. Sunday, February 26, 1911, for the delivery of eulogies on the life, character, and public services of the honorable JONATHAN P. DOLLIVER, late a Member of the United States Senate from the State of Iowa.

The order was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15665. An act providing for the appointment of deputy clerks to the United States circuit court of appeals;

H. R. 20109. An act to quiet title to certain land in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.;

H. R. 15660. An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries;

H. R. 21220. An act transferring Maries County to the eastern division of the eastern judicial district of Missouri; and

H. R. 25235. An act to provide for the sale of lands acquired under the provisions of the reclamation act and which are not needed for the purposes of that act.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

To Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, *Speaker*:

I hereby resign as a member of the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives.

WILLIAM SULZER.

JANUARY 31, 1911.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will be excused from further service on the Committee on Patents.

There was no objection.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SAMUEL D. McENERY.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following order (No. 21), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, the 26th day of February, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. SAMUEL D. McENERY, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The question was taken, and the order was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LINDSAY for one week on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. ADAIR to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of W. P. O'Havre, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, January 30, 1911.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to inform you that I have to-day transmitted to the governor of North Dakota my resignation as a Representative in Congress from North Dakota, to take effect on the 2d day of February, 1911.

Very truly yours,

A. J. GRONNA.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the communication will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

DAM ACROSS WHITE RIVER, MO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 10268) granting to the Ozark Power & Water Co. authority to construct a dam across White River, Mo., a House bill, H. R. 30900, substantially the same, being on the House Calendar.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill (H. R. 30900) of similar title will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 31596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I would ask the gentleman from Virginia if we can agree upon a time for general debate.

Mr. LAMB. I would suggest two hours on either side.

Mr. SCOTT. Can we not get along with an hour and a half?

Mr. LAMB. Well, I will try, if the gentleman thinks best.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that not to exceed three hours be devoted to general debate on this bill, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Pending the gentleman's motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that general debate on the agricultural bill shall not exceed three hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr.

SCOTT] and the other half by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 31596), with Mr. GAINES in the chair.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLIN. Reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman if this bill carries any claims that have been assessed against the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SCOTT. Not any. There are no such claims carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAINES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 31596, the agricultural appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, February 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Weymouth Fore River, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 1334); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the vice president of the Brightwood Railway Co., transmitting the report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1341); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the vice president of the Georgetown & Tenallytown Railway Co., transmitting the report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1340); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Anacostia & Potomac River Railroad Co., transmitting the report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1339); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the vice president of the City & Suburban Railway, transmitting the report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1338); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the vice president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting its report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1336); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the president of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co., transmitting its report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1335); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting its report for the year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1337); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WASHBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31600) to authorize the erection upon the Crown Point

Lighthouse Reservation, N. Y., of a memorial to commemorate the discovery of Lake Champlain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2028), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCALL, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 9449) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2034), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 146) creating a commission to investigate and report on the advisability of the establishment of permanent maneuvering grounds and camp of inspection for troops of the United States at or near the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2021), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 30571) permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2022), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31538) to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2023), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31648) to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2024), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31649) to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2025), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31656) to amend an act amendatory of the act approved April 23, 1906, entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Co. to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pa., from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2026), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31860) permitting the building of a wagon and trolley-car bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2027), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31662) granting five years' extension of time to Charles H. Cornell, his assigns, assignees, successors, and grantees, in which to construct a dam across the Niobrara River, on the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, and to construct electric light and power wires and telephone line and trolley or electric railway, with telegraph and telephone lines, across said reservation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2030), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 32218) to restrain the Secretary of the Treasury from receiving bonds issued to provide money for the building of the Panama Canal as security for the issue of circulating notes to national banks, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2031), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 32219) to provide for the improvement of navigation in the St. Lawrence River and for the construction of dams, locks, canals, and other appurtenant structures therein at and near Long Sault, Barnhart, and Sheek Islands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2032), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31056) to ratify a certain lease with the Seneca Nation of Indians, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2020), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 94) authorizing the President to give certain former cadets of the United States Military Academy the benefit of a recent amendment of the law relative to hazarding at that institution, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2029), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 29300) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a certain 40-acre tract of land, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2033), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32186) for the relief of John A. Trowbridge, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 32315) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW. between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 32316) to authorize the establishing of a national park in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado (by request): A bill (H. R. 32317) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a dam across the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 32318) to extend the time for the further construction of the Valdez, Marshall Pass & Northern Railroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: Resolution (H. Res. 942) for the relief of the widow of David M. Gardner; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GRONNA: Memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota in favor of the discontinuance of the free distribution of seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRAY: Memorial of the Legislature of Montana in favor of San Francisco as site of Panama Canal Exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 32319) granting an increase of pension to Maria C. Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 32320) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Bales; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 32321) for the relief of Stephen Arnold Ritchey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32322) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Waddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 32323) granting an increase of pension to John McCollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 32324) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32325) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 32326) granting a pension to Catherine Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 32327) granting an increase of pension to William Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 32328) granting an increase of pension to William H. Alden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 32329) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 32330) granting an increase of pension to Abner R. Bradney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 32331) granting an increase of pension to Grant Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 32332) for the relief of the legal representatives of H. S. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 32333) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dietrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 32334) granting an increase of pension to Preston Woodmansee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32335) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sherer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: A bill (H. R. 32336) granting an increase of pension to Charles Henning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32337) granting an increase of pension to George King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 32338) granting a pension to Emil Glaser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of National Home Council, Daughters of America, No. 44, of Tiffin, Ohio, urging further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of railway postal clerks of Omaha and vicinity, for enactment of laws granting important concessions—Increase of salaries, time allowance, retirement, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Nelson H. Lawton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Liberty Immigration Society, of New York City, against further restriction on immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASSIDY: Petition of Pattern Makers' Association of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, for removal of oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. H. Carman, secretary of Journeymen Barbers' Union of Cleveland, Ohio, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association, No. 5, J. W. Brown, secretary, of Cleveland, Ohio, relating to hours of daily service in Government work in the United States and District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petitions of citizens of Ingraham and Metropolis, Ill., against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of J. H. Craig, of South Wayne; Woman's Club of Kenosha; and George S. Nichols, of Racine, all in the State of Wisconsin, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Lewisburg Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring further re-

striction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of the third congressional district of Ohio, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petitions of George E. Swain and 15 other citizens of North English; A. H. Evans and 21 other citizens of Williamsburg; and F. W. Mullin and eight others, of Parnell, all in the State of Iowa, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petitions of R. L. Witherspoon and four other citizens of Brownington; Whitley, Killingsworth & Co. and others; James W. Davis and six other merchants, of Brownington; I. A. Young & Co., of Arcola; L. H. Huggins & Co., of Centerville; W. W. Morlan and six others, of Creighton; and Joseph Maury, of Amoret, all in the State of Missouri, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, for building battleship *New York* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Engineers' Club for section 4 in House bill 7117; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, requesting repeal of 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bill for relief of George W. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Washington Camp, No. 210, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ickesburg, Pa., in favoring of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOELKER: Petition of Edw. A. Lonergan and others, for construction of a battleship at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of George D. Roper and C. C. Lockwood, of Rockford, Ill., favoring New Orleans as site of Panama Exposition of 1915; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of W. C. Davis & Son, of Morris, Ill., and others, against a rural parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of business men of Jessie, N. Dak., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of C. S. Anderson and 96 others, of Holland, Minn., against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. J. Nelson and six others, of Slayton, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law by Congress of the parcels-post recommendation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Wheatland, N. Dak., for the Hanna bill (H. R. 26791) providing additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Burnstad, N. Dak., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, against the distribution of free seeds by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of board of supervisors of the city of San Francisco, Cal., approving Senate bill 5677, efficiency in the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of citizens of Brueeville and Waco, Tex., against local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of New Jersey State Federation of Labor, favoring eight-hour clause in naval appropriation bill and building the battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of S. E. Needham, of Logan; Denmark Jensen and others, of Brigham; W. F. Cromar and others, of the State of Utah, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of citizens of Benton, Ky., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Petition of David P. Martin and others, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Lincoln and business men of Alvo and Murdock, Nebr., against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Journeymen Barbers' Union, Local No. 248, of Dubois, Pa., for repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of William Zapper, secretary of Washington Camp, No. 363, Patriotic Order Sons of America, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of James E. Carr and others, in reference to the building of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Petitions of David Schmidt & Co., Dodd & Dearing, J. T. Young, W. T. Barrett, D. P. Richardson, M. Eaton, E. M. Lowe, W. J. Burk, J. Bartholomew, H. G. Canfield, Thomas Murren, C. B. Cozart & Co., S. E. Evans, T. J. Lingenfelter, A. H. Owen, S. A. Glotfelter, G. H. Green, J. T. Wells Hardware Importing Co., A. G. Noel, B. O. Love, E. A. Young, Nicholson Bros., and others, protesting against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRAY: Petitions of 65 merchants and others of Glasgow, Mondak, Cyr, and Cook, Mont., against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Washington Camp No. 12, Patriotic Sons of America; Pride of Potomac Council, No. 12, and Midway Council, No. 44, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, for restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Montgomery County (Md.) Federation of Women's Clubs, for a national bureau of health, with a secretary as a Cabinet officer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petitions of B. J. Austin & Co., A. R. Johns and others, Ewing P. Black, and J. C. Quirk, against local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of the sixteenth congressional district of Texas, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Washington Camp No. 8, Patriotic Order Sons of America, New Haven, Conn., for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Hotchkiss, Colo., against Senate bill 4021, Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of the Langhorne Sorosis, of Langhorne, Bucks County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the children's bureau bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Memorial of the annual session of National Grange, Atlantic City, N. J., against the Owen health bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of David Willets and others, of Trenton, N. J., and James Wood, of Mount Kisco, N. Y., chairman of the Five Years Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends in America, against fortifying the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of New York: Petitions of Charles A. Martin, Daniel O. Michel, George Lyons, William J. Moriarty, and others, favoring construction of a battleship at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of C. L. Thompson Home Mission Council, against appropriations for land or other property of the people for sectarian purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 1, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

GREAT FALLS & OLD DOMINION RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Great Falls & Old Dominion Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1345), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended December 31,